



Appendix T

Copies of Complaint Logs from 2002-2007

Appendix T: Copies of Complaint Logs from 2002-2007

**State of Washington
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Washington Relay Telecommunications Services
Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
CC Docket No. 98-67
June 30, 2002**

Attachment #1

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/01/2001	The customer complained that the CA #3184 gave the wrong phone number as a joke. Customer is against the Caller ID feature.	6/01/2001	The customer wanted their number permanently blocked. Supervisor set up their profile to permanently block their number on Caller ID. Customer was contacted by supervisor and is satisfied with the resolution.
6/04/2001	Customer had a bad experience with CA # 9976. Customer states that CA was typing incredibly slow and continually asked customer to repeat what was said.	6/14/2001	QAR monitored CA, and it was decided that this CA needs further follow up so that her typing speed could improve. Attempt 1: Called customer on 6/18/2002 and left message.
6/08/2001	Customer was placing a call to a shared household (V/TTY) customer explained this to CA # 9007 and asked to speak to a TTY user. CA didn't keep customer informed during the process of the call.	6/13/2001	CSR apologized to customer and forwarded information to CA's manager. QAR coached CA on proper procedures on handling V/TTY answering machines.
6/08/2001	Customer reported that CA#9111F who handled the call misspelled and garbled words in the message.	6/08/2001	Supervisor indicates CA was blind monitored and showed that her typing meets and surpasses Relay requirements.
6/21/2001	Customer complained that the CA #9291F was relaying call very fast and they could not understand the message. When Customer asked CA to repeat, CA became condescending and rude.	6/21/2001	Supervisor apologized to customer and indicated the complaint would be documented. Supervisor discussed the situation with the CA, but CA did not admit that she had been rude. The CA was coached on this issue.
6/26/2001	Customer complained that CA #9988 repeatedly took control of the call to DA and that CA was being too helpful. CA placed the call but asked for a supervisor.	6/26/2001	Supervisor reviewed CA's screen when CA indicated he did not process the call properly. CA's error was noticed and apologized to customer who was informed that there would be a follow-up with the CA. Supervisor coached CA on process of Relay calls. Could not contact Customer due to phone being disconnected.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/29/2001	Customer called complaining about the spelling and typing accuracy of CA #9286F. Customer disconnected and called back to get a better CA.	6/29/2001	CSR apologized for the inconvenience and assured customer that information would be sent to CA's supervisor. CA was scanned and found no serious issues to address. QARS coached CA to pay attention to what she is typing before transmitting data to TTY customer.
7/01/2001	Customer called Relay with an attempt to make a call. CA #9168 didn't follow customer instructions and transferred them to customer service.	7/02/2001	QAR spoke with the CA the complaint. CA claims she never transfers calls to customer service. The CA was coached on when to transfer a call to customer service.
7/07/2001	Customer called CS to indicate he was calling from home to another Local number, but inbound ANI to Relay & RCS shows inbound call as LD. Customer was charged for the LD call and wants credit back.	8/06/2001	TT was issued for this complaint and Account manager was informed. Account manger suggested customer check with LEC to see why they are sending improper digits for the calling number. No CA #
7/13/2001	Customer called and indicated that CA # 9516 was impolite and hung up on them. Customer was disconnected when asked for CA's supervisor.	7/17/2001	FL supervisor indicated that there is no CA at this location that matches that CA number.
7/13/2001	Customer called and complained while attempting to connect to DA through the Relay. Customer indicated he had spoken with 3 different CA's during the attempted to call DA; all 3 CA's failed to follow his instructions and was disconnected.	7/18/2001	CS apologized to customer and indicated information would be submitted to supervisor. Supervisor spoke to all CA's involved in this complaint. CA's indicated caller did ask for 800 DA but then became abusive during each call. CS indicated CA's would be re-trained. ODHHS staff left message on 6/20/2002 still no response.
7/17/2001	The customer stated that she was placing an important call and CA #9152 disconnected. Relay did not reply.	07/17/2001	QA Supervisor apologized to the customer and informed them that it could have been a technical problem. The customer seemed satisfied with that solution.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
7/17/2001	Customer called Relay in an attempt to make an international call and become frustrated with CA numbers #9341M, and #9478. Customer gave CA an international number, which was 08000 00077 but was disconnected with each attempt. On the last Attempt customer got CA # 9908 who was able to make the call for them only to find that the line was busy.	7/18/2001	CS apologized for the inconvenience and that the information would be given to the appropriate personnel. QAR indicated that the customer did not indicate that he was placing an international call during the first attempts. It's easy for the CA's to assume the customer was trying to call an 800 number.
7/17/2001	Customer stated that she thought it was a silly rule that CA's could not relay a pre-typed message, when customers expect to reach an answering machine. Instead a live person answers and CA's are unable to repeat what had been pre-typed for the answering machine.	9/05/2001	Account Manager followed up with customer regarding TRS policy and educated her on how she can request that CA not type entire message and to wait for a live rep. Customer accepted explanation.
7/23/2001	Customer called to complain that CA #9002F was "incompetent" due to unreadable typing.	7/23/2001	Team Leader apologized and informed the customer that CA would be spoken to for coaching.
7/24/2001	Customer called and indicated that CA # 9036M was mixing up numbers and words and prompted caller to ask for supervisor. Supervisor explained that the problem would be documented and followed up on.	8/15/2001	CA indicated to supervisor that he felt caller may have had a possible faulty tty machine. Advised CA to fill out CA feedback form if technical difficulties occur during a call.
7/25/2001	Customer called to suggest that he wanted the "Ur Caller ID will send" macro changed to say "number calling pls". Customer wanted a call back from account manager.	9/19/2001	Information was forwarded to Ken Goulston, WA Account manager who spoke with customer. Customer accepted reason for the Caller ID macro.
7/27/2001	Customer indicated that the CA # 6016F was rude when CA hesitated before responding to her request. The customer said she had to keep repeating "are you there?" to the CA before she got a response and when she did the CA asked her to repeat herself slowly.	8/06/2001	An apology was made and the customer was assured that her complaint would be documented for a follow up. It was discovered that this number is not valid at this time and unable to follow through. Phone number left was an office phone and there is no known VCO user in that office.
8/01/2001	Customer complained that CA's typing speed is too slow. Customer would like to switch back to AT&T. This happened two times. Once with CA #9659M.	09/14/2001	QAR Addressed CA regarding this call. CA #9222F will be scheduled on typing tutor daily and the QAR department will monitor progress. CA #9659 is no longer employed here. ODDH staff called customer's home and there was no answer or answering machine.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
8/03/2001	The customer stated that the CA #9522F interrupted while he was typing. He complained about the system having new CA's that do not know Relay procedures.	8/03/2001	An apology was made to the customer by the supervisor and the customer was assured that his complaint would be documented for further follow up. The CA was talked to about this issue and understands her wrong doings. The CA will be coached by supervisor in regards to this issue.
8/16/2001	CA # 9580 did not respond when VCO user typed "VCO GA" CA only sent "NBR U R CALLING TO PLS" (Alt2). Then VCO customer typed, "Pls get me a supervisor" CA continued to send Alt 2.	8/16/2001	Supervisor reviewed VCO process immediately upon completion of call. CA has recently completed the training process and became confused. CA did demonstrate proper handling of both branded and non-branded VCO calls. The CA was paired with someone for the remaining of their shift to ensure CA is comfortable handling VCO calls. ODHHS staff attempted to contact customer, but have been unsuccessful in reaching customer.
8/20/2001	CA #9518 was not typing message in a timely manner. Typed two or three words then stopped and so on.	8/20/2001	CA stated he typed that way because the person spoke very slowly. CA was coached by QA supervisor on placing the outbound call so the call can flow smoothly. CA recently completed training and will be monitored for follow-up.
8/23/2001	Customer called and was upset because CA #9607F asked her to repeat the number she was calling. Customer hung up before supervisor could provide solution.	8/23/2001	CA stated that she introduced herself to the customer and asked how she may be of assistance. The customer began to speak, but she could not understand what the customer was saying. The customer began to use profanity, then hung up.
8/24/2001	CA #9577 typed 2 or 3 words then stopped, typed 2 or 3 more and stopped throughout the whole call.	8/27/2001	QA supervisor spoke with CA #9577 she stated she did remember the call. The outbound voice person spoke very slowly, stopping every couple of words. QAS coached CA on letting the TTY user know that the outbound voice is speaking slowly.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
8/27/2001	Customer said CA #2175M sent ringing macro and hung up on them. The customer had to redial and place another call.	12/20/2001	CA #2175M is not part of MD TRS CA numbers. The customer may have inadvertently transposed the numbers.
8/27/2001	Customer attempted to call Relay customer service 2 times and no one responded. Customer would like a call back from customer service.	9/07/2001	Due to call volume customer was unable to reach an available customer service rep at that time.
8/27/2001	TTY user has a garbling problem when calling in the Washington Relay Service.	8/28/2001	TT Resolution: Ticket did not state whether or not turning the auto answer off helped. As far as turbo code, this depends on type of uniphone. Tech will continue to investigate this.
8/29/2001	Caller said at the start of the call she was typing the number to dial and instructions. CA #9700F began to dial before instructions were finished.	8/31/2001	QAS spoke with CA #9700F She did admit that she did place the call before the customer sent the "GA". The CA stated that the customer never asked for her ID number. CA was coached by QAS on allowing the customer to take control of the call.
8/30/2001	Customer complained that CA #9819F did not follow their notes or the instructions in the database.	9/14/2001	QAR spoke with CA regarding this complaint. The CA stated that after several attempts dialing the number requested, she noticed that the numbers on the keypad were switched around. Although there was a problem with the numerical keypad the CA was coached regarding paying attention to the dial field when dialing out.
8/30/2001	Customer called Relay to make an outbound call. She was on the line with AT&T when she was typing to CA #9292M and there was no response. CA informed the customer that there was no response and the outbound party had hung up.	9/14/2001	This complaint was forwarded to the technician to find out if there was an equipment problem. Test calls were placed to the customer and found there were no problems with the equipment. The CA listed is no longer employed.
8/31/2001	VCO Customer sent letter stating that 711 dialing process is not the quick 711 dialing service they expected.	9/04/2001	Account manager explained 711-answer sequence for unbranded ANI's. Account manager encouraged customer to use dedicated VCO 800 number for better service.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
9/04/2001	Customer asked CA #9267F to not use macros or set speed and the CA did not respond to the customer's requests.	9/06/2001	CSR spoke to the CA and she stated that she did slow the speed and did not use macros. CA was coached by CSR on following the customer's notes and requests.
9/05/2001	Customer was frustrated CA #9001 kept asking them to pause while they caught up on typing. Customer kept losing train of thought.	9/06/2001	CA was terminated from training on 9/5/2001 because she did not meet Sprints typing speed requirement.
9/11/2001	Customer was upset about how the CA #5187 handled the voicemail. The messages delete after being heard, the CA was not aware of this and was not able to repeat the messages the first time calling.	9/19/2001	Trainer reviewed procedure with CA. No further action.
9/14/2001	The husband of the customer requested supervisor's assistance because CA #9385 was apparently rude to his wife. He stated that the CA placed his wife on hold. The CA came back on the line and said that the wait time is over 5 minutes and she will not stay on hold that long because it is not helping her. She will need to transfer her and at that time the call was disconnected.	9/19/2001	The CA stated that the customer thought that she had taken control of the call. The customer sent a copy of the conversation. The customer was contacted about the complaint and the customer said her last name was not Cook she stated: "it is clearly printed on the complaint, call back later." The customer then disconnected the call.
9/15/2001	CA #9687 typed a long message for the customer; CA informed the customer that the message was left, caller typed, "have a good night." Customer became upset because the CA responded "OK"	9/21/2001	Supervisor addressed CA regarding this complaint. The CA stated that the customer began to make personal conversation with her. Once the "GA" was provided the CA simply typed "OK" because she did not want the customer to continue with the personal conversation. The CA was told that she should have called a supervisor for assistance. The CA was receptive and understood what should be done.
9/17/2001	Customer comment: I just need to inform you, like I was asked to do, that CA #9479F did not follow my profile, like, for example not using macros and do not change the baudot speed like it says in the computer.	9/17/2001	QAR spoke with CA about this call. CA stated that she changed the baudot speed because the customer requested her to do so during the conversation. Supervisor V. Monroe assisted the CA on this call and confirmed that the CA followed the customer's instructions.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
9/17/2001	The customer said that the CA #3005F was rude because she had finished typing what she had said several times and received no response. She said "Hello, Hello" to make sure there was an CA there and the CA said she was waiting for the customer to type "GA"	9/17/2001	Supervisor of TRS apologized to the customer and let her know that the CA's are trained to wait for the GA. The CA was informed that she needs to let the customer know that she is waiting for the GA and thereafter just adapt to the call.
9/21/2001	Customer states that CA #9837F did not know how to dial DA. When finally reaching DA the operator did not give the correct spelling. Also the CA did not change the WPM to 60 as it says in the call notes. The call went slow and the DA operator hung up.	9/24/2001	CA was coached by QAR to contact supervisor for help when needed, as well as coached on DA calls and changing the WPM.
9/29/2001	Customer said that CA #9509 hung up on the customer while being given instructions for an answering machine.	10/02/2001	QAR spoke to CA #9509M regarding this complaint, CA said states that he does not disconnect the customer. CA 9509M was blind monitored, there was no evidence that this CA disconnects customers, however QAR department will continue to monitor this CA. CSS called customer's home and the phone has been disconnected.
9/29/2001	Customer stated: "I do not like operator 9760 because she hung up on me".	10/30/2001	QAS Spoke with CA regarding this complaint. CA stated that she did not recall any problems with calls on this particular day, and states that she would not hang up on a customer. QAS informed the CA of the severity and consequences of disconnecting customers.
10/02/2001	Customer had a couple complaints about CA #9392F. Customer stated that the CA was not Relaying the right message and not typing what the customer said.	10/02/2001	QAR addressed CA about this issue. She was coached on the importance of voicing and typing everything verbatim. Will follow up with QAR scans and evaluations. CSS called customer's home and phone is disconnected.
10/4/2001	Customer called an 800 number through relay and CA hung up on me.	10/10/2001	QAR stated they spoke with the CA regarding this call. CA states that he didn't send a ringing macro because there was no ringing. CA was coached on keeping customer informed of what is going on at all times.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
10/05/2001	Customer was trying to obtain the number to Ultratech. The customer asked CA #9173F to call DA and obtain the number for him. She did obtain the number but it was for Ultratech Travel. Customer was upset.	10/10/2001	QAR told CA she could have activated the record feature to obtain the number from DA. CSS called customer's home and customer no longer lives at this location.
10/09/2001	Voice customer had a general complaint about the Relay. She's had several rude CA's. CA #9221F was asked to speak up and became "huffy" about it.	10/09/2001	Supervisor spoke to CA #9221F regarding this complaint. The CA was coached on professionalism, keeping composure and voice tone.
10/12/2001	Customer complained that when she calls the Relay and wants to use her prepaid calling card they never know how to do it.	10/12/2001	Team leader explained procedure to CA. Customer would type info and leave message on answering machine. Coached CA for further calls in future.
10/25/2001	Customer said that CA #4854 was typing too slow.	10/26/2001	Team leader observed CA. She types 71 WPM.
10/25/2001	Customer said that he was trying to call his doctor. CA #9112F was told that the customer wanted to leave a message for the office and the CA never gave the customer the GA to start the message.	10/26/2001	CS spoke to CA and she said that she had reached a recording and not an answering machine. The CA was coached on responding to a call like this and told to call a supervisor for assistance.
10/30/2001	Customer stated that CA #9267 spoke too fast and not everything was being Relayed correctly. She also stated that typing was really slow.	10/30/2001	Both CA's #9267 and #9580 meet FCC typing requirements. Both CA's were coached on the importance of responding in a timely manner as well as relaying everything heard verbatim and accurately.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
11/01/2001	Customer asked to speak to a supervisor. CA #9159F did not respond and customer feels that her time was wasted.	11/05/2001	QAR addressed CA about this issue although she did not remember taking the call she was coached on what to do when someone asks to speak to a supervisor. CA was also informed that this type of behavior could lead to immediate termination.
11/01/2001	Voice customer called to indicate that during a 711 dial there was a tty tone first and asked if 711 goes to a voice recording saying it is WA Relay. Customer requested a call back from account manger.	12/30/2001	CS explained procedure regarding 711 dialing and would forward information to Ken Goulston. 3 attempts were made to contact customer by the Account Manager and there was no response.
11/05/2001	Customer complained that CA #9580M did not follow instructions to suspend Macros and speed up the typing. The customer feels that this almost made the person on the other end hang up.	11/06/2001	QAR spoke to CA about this issue, although CA did not remember taking the call. CA was coached on following customer's notes in the file.
11/05/2001	Customer called at 9:15PM CA #9517M processed the call, and then typed another number. The customer typed too many numbers and then typed "will call back tmw." The CA typed, "f*%& you retard" then disconnected the call. Rick Witney dean of Washington School for the Deaf called in this complaint.	11/09/2001	After reviewing the complaint and a copy of the conversation, employee was terminated by QAR department.
11/06/2001	Customer said that CA #4830M was not skilled enough to answer a STS call. He was not able to understand the STS customer. The customer decided to call back and get another CA.	11/06/2001	CA said that he did not have a problem understanding unless the voice customer and STS customer were talking at the same time.
11/08/2001	Customer said that he called and does not remember if it was CA #9803F or #9883F who took the call. He stated that when he gave the number to call the CA said he was "dumb" he was upset about this and would like to have them terminated for this.	11/12/2001	Upon reviewing the complaints and researching the CA profile report it was discovered that neither CA's were on line 11/8/2001. Supervisor Luis states that he does not remember this call.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
11/11/2001	Customer said that CA #9076M jumped to dial the number before the customer had finished and said GA. The customer was not happy about this.	11/14/2001	QAR addressed CA regarding this complaint; he stated that he didn't remember this call. CA was coached on proper procedures on how to handle answering machine when leaving a message.
11/12/2001	Customer complained that their request was not being followed. The customer gave the number to call and message to leave. Instead of leaving a message CA #9160M typed the answering machine message and GA. The customer felt that their time was wasted.	11/19/2001	QAR addressed CA regarding this complaint; he stated that he didn't remember this call. CA was coached on proper procedures on how to handle answering machine when leaving a message.
11/28/2001	Customer called to complaint that his calls have been billed wrong and to stop the default billing to Sprint. CS agreed to forward request to Account manager.	12/03/2001	Customers notes were updated to 10-10-636 (clear choice five talk) as requested.
11/29/2001	Customer complained that CA #1691F was rude when the CA told her that she needed to speak directly to the caller. The caller is new to the Relay and was not aware of that.	12/4/2001	CA remembers this call, CA used proper Relay phrase when telling the caller that they needed to talk directly to the caller rather than saying, "tell him" CSR stated that CA was following procedures.
11/30/2001	Customer was verbally abusing CA #6029 so supervisor came over to explain situation to customer. CA was processing call correctly but system was not accepting interruption. Customer was not satisfied and hung up.	11/30/2001	Team Leader was unable to reach customer due to no contact information provided.
12/01/2001	Customer called to complain that CA #4100 was not following customers instructions. Customer also indicated that similar complaint was filed and if nothing were done a letter would be written.	12/01/2001	Supervisor indicated a customer complaint would be issued. CA #4100 Could not remember the call; however he said that he always follows the customer's instructions. ODHH staff tried to contact customer but there was no answer.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/10/2001	Customer called to make a LD call. CA #9332F asked for customer's credit card number to process call. Customer called back later and asked CA #9009F to speak to a supervisor. Customer spoke with the supervisor who informed customer that a credit card number was not needed at all and was unsure why the CA would ask for such information during a LD call.	12/10/2001	Account Manager spoke with customer and assured customer that no credit card charges were made from CA. Customer checked the account the following month and there were no charges billed so customer is satisfied. CA #9332F is no longer employed with the company.
12/14/2001	Customer was upset during an attempt to call a voice number directly, the voice person refused to answer the phone. Customer then decided to call through the Relay and voice person answered the phone, then transferred to TTY line and hung up on the customer. Customer thought CA #4287F hung up during OB call.	12/14/2001	Team Leader apologized to customer, but explained CA performed the right procedure Relaying info to both parties. Also suggested that customer to call the number back directly since they know there is a TTY available. Instructions were given to customer on how to announce the call and the state preference to speak through Relay.
12/20/2001	Customer called Relay and gave a number to dial, was then mistakenly transferred to Spanish Relay.	12/23/2001	CS apologized for the inconvenience and assured that the complaint would be investigated. CA did not remember the call. ODHH staff tried to contact customer but there was no answer, left message on answering machine.
12/20/2001	Customer wished to call Safeway, provided the number and the CA disconnected.	12/28/2001	After receiving this complaint the CA was blind monitored. The CA was not observed disconnecting any calls. The QA department will closely monitor this CA to ensure proper call handling.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/27/2001	During a recent STS call, CA #4162F confused the caller when confirming the spelling of a word. Customer feels that CA should have written down each letter and then made it clear which one she did not understand. Customer would also like STS to adopt a new alphabet system using numbers for letters.	12/27/2001	CA was coached on spelling techniques. Team leader informed customer that the suggestion for the alphabet would be forwarded to a manager for review. Customer was satisfied and would like a follow up call. There is no customer contact info for a follow up.
12/30/2001	Customer was upset when using STS to call another STS user. Both parties had said SK and CA #3229 voiced "SK" to both the inbound and outbound caller. When they did not disconnect the CA said GA. The customer felt this was rude and the CA should have said, "Thank you for using STS Relay" to the outbound caller and disconnect the call.	12/31/2001	Supervisor explained to the customer that it was not our policy to discount an outbound caller, but that his suggestion would be forwarded to the account manager. He would like a follow up call on the matter. Account Manager contacted customer on 6/18/2002 and he was satisfied with the resolution.
12/30/2001	STS customer was on hold for 15 mins waiting for STS CA to become available. He says this is unacceptable and wants to speak to someone concerning STS staffing.	6/18/2002	Customer was contacted by Account Manager and is satisfied with the apology.
01/03/2002	Customer states that she was in the middle of a lengthy call with the phone company trying to figure out her account and resolving an issue, when the CA informed her that they were switching CA's. Then the customer became disconnected. The customer had to go through the whole 30-45 min process all over again and would like to know "must CA's switch during a phone call."	6/20/2002	Unfortunately CA #4344F could not remember this call. Supervisor Lisa Furr coached CA to ensure that when switching over with another CA, make sure to use correct key and do not disconnect the caller. No follow up was done with CA #4334F because she is no longer employed with us. It was stated that it is necessary for CA to switch over calls when break time or end of shift is due. Normally, the new CA observes the call and understands what the call is about before taking over.
01/06/2002	Customer asked CA # 3183 to repeat information that was typed from prior part of conversation. When the CA politely explained that the information was no longer available, the caller asked for a supervisor.	2/05/2002	Supervisor apologized to customer but explained that CA was following correct procedures in not providing the information. Customer understood policy but wanted WA account manager to be aware of her concern.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
01/11/2002	Customer reports that CA #6097F hung up on her. Customer also states that the CA would not wait for "GA" but went ahead.	01/11/2002	Supervisor apologized to customer for the inconvenience and explained policy regarding CA training. Discussed the customer complaint with CA and options in this situation where a customer might be a slow typist. CA stated she would be more sensitive to customers.
01/12/2002	Customer complained that the agent was taking too long to type after the "GA" was given to her. Customer stated, "the operator needs to improve speed."	01/12/2002	Supervisor spoke to CA #9272F regarding this complaint. The CA stated that the reason they were taking so long to type is because the outbound caller was not saying anything and would take so long to reply. The CA was coached on keeping the TTY user informed that there is no response.
01/24/2002	Customer indicated that a call was placed through CA #9281F and CA didn't response after waiting for about 2-4 minutes. Customer hung up to file a complaint and to place the call.	1/30/2002	CS apologized for the inconvenience and informed customer that a follow-up will be done with CA. QAR indicated that the CA followed proper procedures and responded to all customers in a timely manner. CA had no recollection of this call. CA was coached by QA department on keeping customer informed and dialing within 6 seconds.
01/24/2002	Customer complained that the CA # 9067 used a LD company that was not authorized. Customer did not choose Global Crossing as her LD carrier.	01/24/2002	Supervisor apologized to customer, however customers notes indicated Global Crossing for LD calls. CA followed proper procedure.
02/08/2002	Customer is STS user. He stated " the CA jumped the gun before getting all the information from me."	02/10/2002	Supervisor spoke to CA #3228F regarding this call. The CA asked if they were ready to place the call. The CA understood the customer to say yes, there was a pause and the CA dialed the number. The CA continued to place calls for this STS customer.
2/11/2002	Customer called into Relay and placed a call. After person hung up Alt 0 was sent and the customer requested to redial. Customer did not receive a response and there was not signal.	6/19/2002	Unable to follow up with CA #4203 since she is no longer employed with us.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
02/12/2002	Customer complained that when he tries to call his friend but he reaches the Relay instead and he is very upset. He said to call Gwen at Qwest and straighten out the situation.	2/12/02	Account Manager informed customer that if he were dialing a number that contains the numbers 711 he would reach the relay. Customer was also informed to contact his LEC to start a ticket on this problem. There is not much more we can do about this.
2/15/2002	Customer said CA #4030F did not respond and kept customer on hold too long. The customer hung up and tried to redial Relay again but could not get through because Relay still had him on hold.	02/15/2002	Team leader spoke to CA and she stated that she did not respond because she kept receiving a message on her screen that read "inbound caller disconnected". She did not put customer on hold.
02/22/2002	Customer said CA #9604M hung up on them after the customer asked the CA to redial a person who did not want to accept Relay calls.	02/28/2002	QAR spoke with the CA regarding this complaint however he had no recollection of the call. When confronted the CA stated that he did not disconnect a call on a customer. He was told that it is grounds for termination. The CA will be monitored by the QA department.
3/02/2002	Washington TTY user concerned that CA #9193M spoke too fast and unclearly when leaving several answering machine messages for this customer last Sunday.	3/04/2002	QAR monitored CA #91963M to further investigate. CA performed quite well and spoke clearly on all calls observed. QAR coached CA on the importance of clarity to ensure his voice is received clearly to the voice person. QAR will continue to monitor this CA.
03/03/2002	Customer was transferred to Customer Service when he requested a supervisor. Customer reports that he "was made fun of and made to be confused by CA #9071F."	03/10/2002	Customer was using profanity towards the CA. A supervisor was involved and the customer was warned that if he continued to use profanity that the call would be disconnected.
03/04/2002	Complaint was that CA #9728M did not read the profile that says do not use macros and to set speed at 60wpm. Neither request was followed.	03/12/2002	QAR addressed CA about this call. CA stated he did not remember the call and that he always follows the customer's notes in the file. The CA has an overall good performance. The QAR department will closely monitor the CA to ensure that he is adhering to the customer's request.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
03/14/2002	Customer requested for operator to change the voice customer's message who was speaking in the third person. CA #4938 insisted they had to type message verbatim which included "ask her" or "did she" customer was upset because CA typed in third person.	03/19/2002	Customer was asking CA to break Relay policy and she was not allowed to do that. Supervisor was present during call. The CA properly redirected that voice user. CA followed correct policy.
3/26/2002	The customer complained that the CA #9228F kept redialing without authorization. Customer also states that the CA did not inform him of what was going on.	3/26/2002	CA stated that customer asked her to continue to redial until call was answered. Brad, the supervisor did say that he looked at her screen and did not see anywhere that the customer asked her to keep redialing and CA did not keep customer informed. CA is a recent graduate and does perform quite well, however disciplinary action will be taken.
03/28/2002	Customer said CA called her house and gave their ID number as #193F. CA was female and kept saying "I can't type that fast" and hung up on the customer when asked to speak to a supervisor. Customer would like feedback by phone in the evening hours.	03/29/2002	Team leader apologized to customer for the problem. Verified with customer that #193 was the entire number given by the CA. Told customer feedback would follow after their request.
4/01/2002	HOH caller requested that CA #9354M transfer her to DA. He told her the call was being transferred and there was nothing more said.	05/30/2002	QAR spoke with CA about this call and explained the importance of adhering to customer's requests.
4/11/2002	Customer complained that she could not see her fathers phone number on her Caller ID. Receives Caller ID on non-Relay calls.	4/12/2002	CS explained that on direct calls Caller ID will pass through, however with Relay calls anything outside of Relay considers local (40 Miles) the ID will not attempt to pass through.
4/12/2002	Customer stated that CA #9687F harassed him and called him stupid then transferred him to a supervisor without permission. He said he would like something done about CAs requesting supervisors without his consent.	4/12/2002	CA will be coached by shift Manager on the importance of keeping the customer informed when a supervisor is being requested. Appropriate action will be taken.
4/15/2002	Customer complained that all CA's are slow and informed CS to change the WPM but nothing was done.	4/15/2002	CS apologized to customer and offered to add 65 wpm to his customer notes. No CA# provided.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
4/19/2002	Customer: “ My husband is deaf and he used the Relay to leave a message on my answer machine but the operator spoke so fast that I could not understand the message. It was CA #9153F.	4/21/2002	The CA was coached by QAR on the importance of speaking moderately when voicing the TTY user’s message. Nonetheless the QAR department will follow up with scans and evaluations.
4/23/2002	Customer asked CA #9547F to type a message on her brother’s answering machine. The caller typed “hello, are you there.” And there was another long pause. Finally the CA responded by typing (MSG). The customer was very upset that the CA did not respond promptly and stated that she would fax the transcript of the call to us.	4/25/2002	QAR met with CA regarding this call and she did remember handling this call. The CA stated that she did not hear the call come into her console. QAR coached the CA on the importance of responding to customers in a timely manner. Appropriate action will be taken. Follow up customer resolution: QA department contacted customer and apologized for the poor service. Informed customer that the CA was coached on proper procedures and appropriate action will be taken.
4/26/2002	The CA #4643 did not notify the person that the call had been dialed and then did not indicate that the phone was ringing. Afterwards the CA disconnected the caller.	4/24/2002	Supervisor followed up with CA #4643F. She does not recall any strange incident that popped up on the screen. She always Relays # and phone ringing. This could have been a possible technical problem.
05/13/2002	Caller complained that CA #9409M disconnected his call after an 800 number had been provided to call.	5/13/2002	QAR met with CA and coached CA on the importance of not disconnecting calls and the importance of adhering to policies. Appropriate action will be taken. Follow up customer resolution: 1 st attempt: contacted customer on May 14 th @5:51pm EST. Informed customer that the CA was addressed and coached on procedures that should have been followed. Also informed customer that appropriate action would be taken against CA. The customer was thankful for the call and was satisfied with the resolution provided.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
05/15/2002	CA #9172 abused his job. I asked operator to press for a live person, The CA stated that there was no option for that. So I asked him to press "1" and CA typed (need a reason). I went ahead explaining the reason for this call and then the operator said (now wasn't that better Q).	5/15/2002	QAR met with CA. Coached CA on the importance of remaining transparent and maintaining a professional image when communicating with customers. Appropriate action will be taken.
5/21/2002	TTY caller called in stating that the CA # 9472 hung up on him. He said that he had instructed the CA to an option to make an appointment. CA then typed redialing and then disconnected the call.	5/21/2002	CSR apologized to customer for the inconvenience and informed customer that CA would be addressed about this issue.
5/22/2002	Customer is reporting trouble experienced by her son who is a TTY user. He was placing a pizza order through Relay and CA # 9294 used abbreviations that he was unfamiliar with. Her son reads at a second grade level and does not understand most abbreviations.	05/23/2002	QAR met with CA. QAR coached CA on the importance of only utilizing abbreviations approved by Sprint. Follow up customer resolution: 1 st attempt: Contacted customer on May 23 rd @ 7:04pm EST. Apologized to the customer for the inconvenience and informed her that here was a technical problem, which caused the messages to appear garbled. The customer was thankful for the info and was satisfied with the resolution.
5/22/2002	Customer complained that CA #9393F messed up their call. The CA was instructed to leave a message on the answering machine but it took the CA over 15 minutes to leave the message.	5/23/2002	QAR met with CA. Coached CA on the importance of responding in a timely manner. Also coached A on the importance of keeping the customer informed. Follow up customer resolution: 1 st attempt: Contacted customer on May 23 rd @ 8:34p.m. EST however reached a recording stating the number is no longer in service.
5/23/2002	Customer was upset that CA #9133M did not leave her message the first time as requested. She had typed the message before the call was placed and asked the CA to leave it if an answering machine picked up. She had to have CA redial twice before they finally left her message.	05/26/2002	QAR met with CA and coached on importance of following customer's requests.

Resolved Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/25/2002	Customer complained that CA's are not recognizing IB call as VCO branded. Customer indicates he requested branding 6 months ago and worked fine until today.	5/28/2002	CS apologized for inconvenience and informed customer there was a technical problem since branding was not shown on CS screen. Tech has re-branded customer as VCO, customer was previously branded as TTY.
5/25/2002	Customer complained that when she places long distance calls using AT&T, her call would not connect.	5/25/2002	QAR entered a trouble ticket . Ticket number is 10000196007. Technician made several test calls using AT&T. Unable to reach customer without name provided.

Irresolvable Consumer Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/07/2001	Customer complained that CA typed wrong information during a Relay call to set up a Dr's appt.		Customer did not have CA # that is needed to follow up complaint.
6/07/2001	Customer called CS to complain that many of his OB calls had hang ups due to voice person assuming Relay is a sales call. Customer recommends that Relay introduction greeting be changed.		Customer did not wish to leave name and phone number for follow up contact. No CA #. CS forwarded Information to Account manager.
7/09/2001	Customer complained that CA didn't follow instructions to use MCI as a LD carrier.		Team Leader suggested that customer provide CA# in order for us to properly investigate complaint and coach CA.
7/10/2001	Customer complained that all WTRS CA's type very slow.		No CA # provided.

Irresolvable Consumer Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
7/12/2001	Customer complained that VCO branding has dropped		No CA # provided. Supervisor explained that the VCO branding issue was a known problem and that technicians were working on replacing the brandings.
7/21/2001	Customer uses STS and makes calls to Spanish speaking people. She would like to have Spanish translation available through STS.		Ken Goulston was emailed with information to contact customer. Ken contacted customer and indicated that she could use STS and transfer to Spanish speaking CA.
9/06/2001	Customer reported having experience with a garbling problem and cannot process the call successfully when calling through FI Relay. Customer was able to successfully complete calls through the SD Center but not FI.		No CA number was provided. CS Explained to customer that CA # would be needed to investigate complaint.
11/05/2001	Customer called to suggest that WTRS announcement needed to be changed. Frustrated with voice people thinking it's a marketing call and not interested in accepted the calls from him.		CS apologized to customer and forwarded information to account manager. No CA involved with this call. Unable to reach customer.
1/18/2002	Customer called to complain that her fathers number did not appear on her Caller ID and that it only shows "out of area".		CS issued a TT and the tech's indicated that the Caller ID will not transmit over 40 miles. Call was out of the area. Customer was contacted with an explanation regarding the Caller ID issue.
1/26/2002	Customer complained that supervisor disconnected him. Customer claims supervisor used profane language, but did not get supervisors ID #		CS supervisor apologized for behavior of the other supervisor, but explained they would need a name to do a follow up. CS indicated incident would be reported as a complaint and customer was satisfied.
1/27/2002	Customer complained that a supervisor disconnected him.		No CA# provided and could not follow up without appropriate information.
2/03/2002	Voice Customer called VCO user through Relay and indicated VCO user was not receiving typed messages from CA. No CA # provided.		There was not enough information to completely troubleshoot this issue.

Irresolvable Consumer Complaints

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
2/06/2002	Customer was very angry with all Relay supervisors who have called him names and disconnected them.		Team leader apologized to customer and thanked him for letting Relay know about the problem. No CA # provided
2/07/2002	Customer complained that the system cut short, and also received duplicate welcome greetings. Customer requested Account manager contact him.		TT indicates that there was not enough information in the problem description. No CA # provided
4/02/2002	Customer complained that he is having problems making a LD call. No CA # provided.		Placed test calls using the information given and could not duplicate the problem. If problem happens again, encouraged customer to provide CA#.

**State of Washington
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Washington Relay Telecommunications Services
Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
CC Docket No. 98-67
June 30, 2003**

Acronym Log

CA: Communication Assistant
AM: Account manager
QAR: Quality Assurance Rep
TL: Team Leader
CS: Customer Service
CSS: ODHH Customer Support Specialist
ODHH: Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/10/2002	Customer stated that he asked CA #9173F for her ID number 3 times and her response was "What number."	6/10/2002	Supervisor met with CA. Based on information gathered from both the CA and customer, there was no wrong doing on the CA's part. Customer follow-up: Contacted customer on June 11 th @ 8:38pm however reached a recording stating number was disconnected.
6/11/2002	S2S customer wanted to know why he was put on hold for so long when calling S2S Relay. He stated he would like feedback on this.	6/15/2002	Account Manager contacted the customer and stated the ASA was at 57.5 and will alert operations of this long delay. Customer was satisfied with the solution.
6/11/2002	Customer Comments: " I just received feedback from a voice person who stated that CA# 7031 was extremely rude when processing my call."	6/16/2002	The agent identified in this complaint is unassigned. Training administrator contacted the customer, apologized for the delay in responding and informed the customer that without the proper ID number there is no way to give agent feedback. Attempted to contact customer on 7/11/02, 7/17/02, & 7/22/02 – left detailed message to contact ODHH.
6/19/2002	The voice user received a call from TTY user via WA Relay service. Voice user informed TTY user that they had a TTY in the office and asked that the CA 9784M switch the call to TTY instead. The CA stated he did not know how to do that. Customer feels CA should be retrained. Although customer knows that TTY-to-TTY is not possible she felt that the CA should have been able to inform them of that.	7/17/2002	QAR met with CA #9784M and coached him on the importance of keeping the customer informed of our inability to process TTY to TTY calls. Contacted Customer 7/17/02 to explain solution and she was satisfied.
6/24/2002	Customer stated that CA #9976F had very poor spelling and she could not type at least 60 wpm.	6/26/2002	CA's typing speed meets FCC requirements. QAR met with CA and coached her on the importance of typing accurately to ensure messages are received and understood. No Contact information provided.
7/2/2002	Business phone not able to make LD calls via WA Relay even though customer database info entered 4-3-02 regarding carrier of choice.	10/4/2002	Technicians made several test calls using calling information. More info is needed to complete troubleshooting this issue. Attempts (3) to contact customer

			were unsuccessful. NO CA # provided to specifically investigate the original relay site. Attempted contact dates: 8/12/02, 8/16/02, and 10/04/02.
7/3/2002	Customer called CS stating that when she calls a TTY nbr that she get a loud bong tone in her ear every time she calls this TTY nbr	8/1/2002	Technical issue – Technicians tested TTY number and could not hear any bong tones. Could not duplicate the problem customer had been hearing when making calls to this TTY number. 8/12/02 – Spoke with customer regarding the technical issues & she stated that the sounds happen only when the phone is ringing.
7/6/2002	Customer called to complain that CA #6889F hung up without finding out if the TTY user was done. Also the customer stated that he felt victimized and made fun of because he is deaf and blind.	08/20/2002	Customer contacted by FCC compliance officer explained that he felt the CA did not intend to offend him, but that the customer needs to be a little more patient with the CA's.
7/13/2002	Customer complained that when he called the relay that CA #1634M did not type clearly and he could not understand. Team leader checked the screen and the typing was fine and clear. Customer also complained that the Supervisor was not typing clear either. Screen was checked and it was clear.	10/4/2002	TL apologized to the customer for the frustration and informed the customer that everything was being typed clearly. It was suggested that there may be a problem with the customer's equipment itself. Customer would like a follow up. TT issued #286609. CSS made 3 attempts to contact customer. Customer may be Deaf-Blind.
7/15/2002	Customer was using profanity towards CA #9227 and said that he wanted to punish her for not redialing his number faster. QA rep informed customer that he did not allow CA enough time to enter the calling card info after she redialed the number.	7/16/2002	QAR met with CA #9227 and coached her on the importance of adhering to the three-second dial out policy. No customer info was given for follow up.
7/16/2002	Voice customer states that CA #9357M did not give the normal announcement upon calling to a company that she knew always gives their company name and greeting. The CA just said "hello" instead of giving the company's announcement.	7/18/2002	QAR met with CA and coached him on the importance of properly announcing the relay service. Also coached CA on the importance of keeping customers informed at all times. No customer contact was provided for follow up.
7/19/2002	Caller said that CA # 9608F reached an answering machine, caller left message. CA stated "is that a GA?" caller asked "Why?" CA said because I think there is a person on line now. Also the caller said the CA was typing slow and was constantly saying "is that a go ahead?" Caller said that was very distracting and hopes that CA will be trained again.	7/25/2002	QAR met with CA and coached her on procedures to follow in this situation. Also reminded her that prompting is only allowed once. The CA's typing speed meets FCC requirements. No customer contact was provided for follow up.

7/19/2002	Customer is a speech therapist; she reports that she received a message on her voice answering machine from a client thru the relay. The message was left so quietly and with such poor articulation that she was unable to understand the message.	7/19/2002	TL apologized for the occurrence and told her that The message would get passed on to customer service, but that the number she provided would be hard to track since it is a 5 digit number. Attempt 1: compliance office called and left message on 8/13/02. Customer called on 8/18/02 and said she was satisfied with the resolution.
7/20/2002	Customer complained that CA #9474F took a long time to dial the number to call.	7/23/2002	QAR met with CA and coached on the importance of dialing out in a timely manner. No contact info was provided for follow up.
7/22/2002	Customer complained that CA9345F was smacking in her party's ear. When another CA relieved the call, the caller's party informed me of the problem.	7/22/2002	Supervisor met with CA and coached her on the importance of utilizing the mute feature when clearing throat. No contact information was provided for follow up.
7/29/2002	Customer complained that CA #9926F did not follow her requests to provide her telephone number several times, instead the CA had the customer repeat the information several times.	7/30/2002	Attempted contacts: QAR contacted customer on July 30 @11:15p.m. Spoke with irate male person and was instructed not to call this number again for Margaret Pitts. 2 nd attempt: 8/13/02 Called on TTY and no answer. 3 rd attempt: 8/14/02 Called through Relay and heard fax tones. 4 th attempt: 8/14/02 Unknown user email address.
8/5/2002	Customer states that CA #9229 was wasting her time trying to use her calling card 4 times and then hung up on customer.	9/25/2002	QAR coached CA on the importance of not disconnecting calls. Also advised the CA of the consequences of doing so. There is no contact information provided for this customer.
8/9/2002	BRDU customer reached CA # 9214F and typed a message in case she reached an answering machine. After typing the instructions CA # 9214F did not respond.	9/25/2002	QAR met with CA and coached her on the importance of following customer's instructions and promptly responding to all calls received. There is no contact information provided for this customer.
8/9/2002	TTY user called in and stated that she made a call around 8:05 p.m. and three minutes into the call, the call disconnected. He wanted to make sure it was not purposely.	11/12/2002	QAR met with CA #9609F and coached the agent on the importance of not disconnecting calls. QAR also advised the CA of the consequences of doing so. CA was told to report any technical problems. CSS made 3 attempts to contact this customer.

8/17/2002	Customer stated that her father uses relay and when he calls her through the relay, his number does not show up on her caller ID. If he calls direct or to her cell phone his number does show up.	10/04/2002	CSS made 3 attempts to contact this customer. Tech indicated to customer that it may be due to the LD call as the reason the caller ID did not show up on her cell phone.
8/19/2002	Washington STS customer wants to make us aware that STS staffing needs checking into. This evening this customer had to wait for the STS Relay phone line to ring 85 times before a CA answered it.	10/18/2002	Staffing will be checked and improved and answering machine will be checked as well when CA's are busy with other customers. Customer called stating all problems have been resolved.
8/20/2002	Washington STS customer frustrated for 2 nd night in a row. He stated that he had to wait for 5 minutes after dialing into the STS Relay for a CA to answer.	10/18/2002	CSS made 2 attempts on 9/25, 10/4 & left message to contact ODHH. Customer called stating that problem has been resolved.
8/29/2002	Washington STS customer is frustrated that at 4:10 p.m. it took 5 minutes for a STS agent to answer the call. He states that he hopes it is because they are busy with other calls.	10/18/2002	CSS made 2 attempts on 9/25, 10/4 & left message to contact ODHH. Customer called stating that problem has been resolved.
9/02/2002	Customer became upset when he asked the operator to repeat his message. He stated that he does not want everything heard, typed.	9/2/2002	CA #9114F followed proper procedure. QA Supervisor coached agent on how to handle an irate customer. There was no contact info provided for further follow up.
9/12/2002	Customer states that CA #9212M demonstrated numerous spelling errors. Customer wants to know why spelling errors occurred. Customer provided copy of conversation to show proof that there was indeed spelling errors.	10/30/2002	Met with & coached CA on the importance of backspacing to correct typographical errors to ensure that messages are received clearly. CSS attempted to contact customer on 10/30 and found that the number has been disconnected.
9/14/2002	Customer stated approximately 9:50pm She was on a call with a friend who was real upset. CA #9792F interfered and stated (Tell her to keep her head up) The customer did not feel that was appropriate for the CA to do. She is concerned the CA will call the voice individual and give her more advice.	9/14/2002	Team Manager met with CA #9792F and coached her on the importance of remaining transparent. Appropriate action will be taken. CSS made 3 attempts to contact customer 10/29/02: left message, 11/04/02: no answer left message, and 11/4/02 again no answer and left message.
9/18/2002	Customer was trying to make an important call, when she provided CA #9310F with the number customer was transferred to OSD. She then asked OSD to transfer her back to the relay and they were not able to do so.	9/25/2002	QAR spoke with CA about this complaint and coached her on the proper procedures to follow. CA was also advised that inappropriate behavior would not be tolerated. Due to the CA transferring the customer without authorization, appropriate action will be taken. No contact info provided.

9/30/2002	VCO user was upset because she was not able to access the FD on her home #. She was transferred to customer service twice and was put on hold for a very long time. She said it was an emergency and she needed to be able to call a # in her FD.	9/30/2002	Team Leader apologized but told her that they were unable to access her home FD list from her work #. Called DA but the # was not listed. Again apologized to customer. She hung up. No contact information was provided for further follow up.
10/7/2002	VCO Customer frequently receives incoming calls to her business and answers with "Hello this is Michelle with DVR, GA" but CA 7878F did not start typing until a hearing person within the office assisted her by telling the CA that the VCO person had given the GA. Customer wanted to know if there was anything else she could do to indicate to the CA that she is a VCO user & for the CA to begin relaying the call.	10/7/2002	CS apologized to Customer and explained that her line is branded VCO and that there is a note in place that the agent should see both and begin typing immediately. There wasn't much else the customer could do clarify it with the CA. CS told customer complaint would be documented & forward it to supervisor for coaching CA. No contact information given.
10/10/2002	Customer stated that CA # 9691M had poor spelling and typing accuracy during a relay call at 7:45pm on 10/5/02 while attempting to communicate with her mother who was in the hospital.	10/18/2002	CS reviewed the tracking system and discovered no one was logged in using this particular ID #. CA 9691F was not scheduled to work on the day in question. 10/18 – emailed customer & shared the explanation to her, which she accepted.
10/10/2002	Customer stated that CA 9404F messed up the call when CA dialed a toll free number and instructed CA to press "0" for live operator. When CA dialed, a recording came on and disconnected. Customer then instructed CA to dial 411 to get the local number to the WA state Bank from DA. CA dialed new number and a male operator came on and could not hear CA. Customer asked for supervisor to switch to a new CA, when new CA took over customer found she had reached Washington Mutual.	10/17/2002	CS apologized to customer for the inconvenience and informed customer this matter would be investigated. Supervisor investigated further and found that the voice person at Washington Mutual was experiencing technical difficulties hearing the CA and switched to another phone. CA was coached on the importance of adhering to customer's instructions, relaying verbatim and keeping the customer informed, which could have prevented the problem. No contact info given.

10/17/2002	Customer stated that CA 9608M typed sloppy, slow and funny.	10/18/2002	CA was addressed and coached on the importance of correcting typographical errors made to ensure the message is received clearly. CA was also advised that if not sure of the spelling of a word to get clarification from the customer. No contact information provided.
10/24/2002	Customer stated the supervisor Maggie disconnected the call while Customer was changing TTY paper.	10/24/2002	CS apologized to customer for the inconvenience and informed customer a report would be filed. Program Mgr met with supervisor concerning this incident, supervisor stated that she identified herself and after 3 minutes of no response from the TTY user the call was disconnected. Supervisor also documented that she had disconnected the call due to no response. No contact Info provided.
10/28/2002	Customer stated that CA had bad spelling and missing part of the conversation what was said to them.	10/29/2002	CS apologized to customer and informed customer that a complaint would be sent to CA's relay center. No CA # or contact info was provided.
10/29/2002	Customer called ODHHS and stated that his deaf stepdaughter made calls through 711 and was being billed for outrageous amounts. Customer indicated that he had called AT&T and placed a LD block on her phone. Complaint referred to WA Account manager.	10/30/2002	AM contacted customer and explained that LD block placed by LEC does not necessary block all LD calls via relay. This is primarily because the LEC does not recognize 711 as a toll free number. AM requested that customer call Sprint Relay Customer service and establish a customer data base profile to put a block on all LD calls via relay. Customer satisfied with solution.
11/6/2002	Voice person had a difficult time understanding CA#9263 and had to ask her several times to repeat what she has said. The CA was rude and patronizing and kept telling the voice person that the CA could not get involved in the call.	11/07/2002	QAR met with CA. CA stated that the voice customer wanted her to repeat information that had previously been relayed. QAR coached CA on how to remain professional, while following proper call procedures. CA was also advised to work on voice tone. No contact information provided for further follow up.

11/6/2002	Customer stated that CA#9024F was rude and impatient. The customer told the CA that she had never received a relay call before and the CA never gave an explanation about what the call was regarding. The CA was typing everything I was saying to the other person that called me. CA needs to be more patient and not so rude.	11/7/2002	QAR met with CA and coached the CA on the importance of exhibiting patience, politeness, and professionalism while relaying. CA was also coached on the importance of using the standard explanation phrase verbatim. No contact information was provided for further follow up.
11/14/2002	Customer states that yesterday they kept disconnecting on me and today they disconnected again which pissed me off. CA's # was 9614M - CS apologized for the inconvenience and informed him that his complaint would be documented and forwarded to supervisor.	1/01/2003	Met with CA and advised CA of the consequences of disconnecting calls. No contact information provided for follow up.
11/15/2002	Customer complained that CA#9872M did not follow his request. The CA was instructed to press pound seven, seven to retrieve his voicemail messages. The CA pressed seven and all the messages were lost.	11/18/2002	QAR reviewed the tracking system and this ID number was not logged in the system on the day of the complaint. Also reviewed three days prior to the complaint date and ID number was not used. Will need additional information for this complaint. No contact information provided.
11/19/2002	Customer placed a call earlier and the operator was typing an answering machine. After she typed GA, Customer told CA#9920 to call back and let the customer know when to leave the message. The CA did not respond. Customer said "hello, hello" and there was no response so the customer hung up and called back 2 mins later.	11/21/2002	QAR met with CA on the importance of responding in a timely manner remaining attentive while processing calls. Attempt 1: contacted customer on 11/25 9:37pm spoke with Mrs. Shaffer whom relayed the messages to Allan as I spoke. Informed the customer that the CA was coached on the importance of responding in a timely manner and thanked him for reporting this incident to us. The customer was thankful for the call back and was satisfied with the resolution. CSS made 3 attempts to contact customer.
11/21/2002	Customer stated that CA#4883M did not leave his message to his mom as fast as he asked him to. Customer said CA called him dumb and stupid.	12/16/2002	CS apologize for what happened & assured customer that CA's supervisor would be notified. CSS attempts to contact the customer and there was no answer or a machine to leave a message.

11/21/2002	Customer wants an apology from Supervisor Randy for being abusive, aggressive, and disconnecting the call.	12/16/2002	CS apologized to customer & informed him the complaint would be documented. CSS made 3 attempts to contact the customer, but there was no answer and no machine to leave a message.
11/21/2002	Customer wants an apology from Supervisor Carol for being abusive and hanging up on him.	12/16/2002	CSS 3 attempts to reach the customer by phone and there was no answer and no machine to leave a message.
11/22/2002	Customer states that CA 8752F hung up on her twice this morning. CA hung up while customer was typing instructions after GA. Customer did not receive anything then the line hung up. Customer dialed again and got the same CA. Customer called back to report the incident. Thanked customer for letting us know of this incident & apologized for the inconvenience & informed customer that the incident would be documented & forwarded to the appropriate center. Customer does not request follow up.	12/03/2002	Coached CA on improper disconnection & call processing procedure of improper disconnection.
11/26/2002	The user complained that the CA did not use proper tone when leaving TTY message.	12/10/2002	TL spoke with CA #4538F and she does not recall speaking to this customer. She stated that she would never assume the voice tone that was relayed. Customer contact info not provided.
12/04/2002	Customer complained that the CA 4538F did not use proper tone when leaving TTY msg. CS informed customer that this complaint will be forwarded to center for proper follow up.	12/10/2002	Spoke with CA and she doesn't recall the call. She said she would never assume the voice tone that is relayed.
12/15/2002	Customer stated that letters on his VCO machine were coming in as numbers. He wanted someone to call him back regarding this issue. CS Thanked customer for letting CS know.	12/16/2002	AM spoke with the onsite tech that said garbling tends to happen with this type of equipment. CS rep returned customers call & informed him that the garbling was due to the equipment.

12/20/2002	Customer Stated that CA 9551F refused to leave his message. QA rep apologized to customer for the inconvenience and informed him that his complaint would be documented and forwarded to the proper dept.	12/23/2002	QA rep met & Coached CA on the importance of adhering to customer's requests. Advised CA of the consequences of refusing to honor customer's requests. No contact information provided.
12/29/2002	Customer's phone is no longer branded for VCO and CA was not able to brand it. His number is coming up restricted, or public phone. Customer stated that this is the same number he has had for several years now.	12/30/2002	Tech determined that the phone is no longer branded and the number came in restricted or public number. The customer was told that the LEC may have put a restriction on the phone number. Attempted to contact customer, but person answering the phone indicated that customer had moved.
01/03/2003	Customer was upset because she had received an obscene and threatening call from a TTY user. She felt the relay and CA should have some type of control as to what is said over the phone. She did not appreciate that call at all. CS apologized to customer for the inconvenience & informed her that she could have relay calls blocked. Customer declined to be transferred to customer service but requested contact from AM	4/10/2003	FCC compliance officer contacted Customer, explained the TRS minimum requirements to her, she accepted solution but wanted a copy emailed to her. Customer also stated that she instructed CA to stop the conversation several times & CA did not response to her requests. No CA # given by customer, cannot follow through with CA.
1/6/2003	Customer was very upset that she could not get through to a CA at the WA Relay svc VCO designed line at 1-800-833-6386 or to the regular line of 1-800 833-6388. Customer states that she had a very important call that needed to be made at 11:30pm & attempted to reach relay 4 times and each time she got a answering machine message to hold for the next available CA and then no CA ever came on the line. She states that she waited 15 minutes and finally was able to place the call only to find that the party she was trying to reach had left for the day. Customer did not have CA # who finally was able to place her call.	1/8/2003	CS apologized for the problem and assured that the complaint would be sent to the WA AM on the issue. Am states that according to ASA records, only 3 centers experienced higher than normal ASA. Without customer calling from #, AM is not able to determine where the call was routed. The 3 centers with high ASA were Missouri, Minn, & Fla. Its highly possible that the call went to Fla center since they had received a higher than normal call volume at that time. No contact info for customer follow up.

1/8/2003	Customer stated that she uses 711 to make her calls from her office; she receives a recording stating, “you must dial 1 or 0 to complete your call”. When she dials the same number directly she get through with no problem. Customer has a 2 nd phone line that rolls over, but she cannot recall that number. CS apologized for the problem and informed her that a trouble ticket to see what the problem is. Customer requested contact with solution.	1/9/2003	Technical support contacted customer and ran a couple test calls to the relay services dialing 711. All test calls were successfully completed through the relay and technician was unable to duplicate the problem. FCC compliance officer contacted customer to ensure that the solution was acceptable. Customer states that she was very satisfied.
1/8/2003	Customer stated that after the call was connected to relay, she did not receive any response from the CA. No macros were ever sent. QA Rep apologized to customer for the inconvenience and informed her that her complaint would be documented & forwarded to the QA dept.	1/10/2003	Met with CA & was informed that CA had experienced technical difficulties at her terminal. Coached CA on the importance of reporting technical issues to her supervisors so that a trouble ticket can be entered. No customer contact info provided.
1/13/2003	Customer states that she called in through CA 9345F & requested a number be dialed but the CA did not response or place the call for her. Customer said she waited typing “hello, hello, GA, GA” and still received no response from CA and was disconnected. QA Rep apologized to customer for the inconvenience and informed her that her that the CA would be addressed regarding this matter.	1/15/2003	Reviewed Rockwell reporting, CA’s numbers were comparable to others logged into the system at the same time. Met with CA & coached on the importance of responding in a timely manner. Advised agent of the consequences of disconnecting calls. No customer contact info provided.

1/16/2003	Customer stated that he was frustrated that CA continued typing and did not directly respond to customers request to please repeat that I could not hear you. Customer also asked for CA # during call and CA did not give it to until after the call. At that time customer also asked for supervisor & CA said this line will disconnect. Call was then disconnected.	1/17/2003	I apologized & asked if customer wanted to follow up, he said no as long as this CA is more responsive in the future. Unable to follow up with CA as there is no CA #.
1/23/2003	Customer complained that CA 4619FF had typing errors and mistyped the wrong greeting so she had to hang up on CA. CS apologized to customer for the inconvenience. Caller requested call back for follow up.	1/29/2003	TL indicates that CA typed what she heard, "fine" & later learned that the person said "sign". CA apologized to the customer at the time. CA made an error but followed correct procedures by typing what she heard. Made 3 attempts to call customer back & left messages on TTY answering machine. 1/28/03 – 2pm, left message, 1/28/03 – 4:30pm – busy, 1/29/03 – 3:30pm left msg.

1/23/2003	Customer complained that CA 8738F had typing errors and mistyped the wrong greeting so she had to hang up on CA. Apologized for her inconvenience.	2/20/2003	CA could not have typed the wrong greeting since it is an automatic greeting with macros. Not enough detailed info to determine what happened. Discussed with CA about being careful with typos & typing verbatim. CSS made 3 attempts to contact customer for a follow up & left messages.
1/27/2003	Customer stated that CA 7779M did not handle his call or leave message as he requested and made fun of him using bad language & calling him names. Apologized to the customer and explained that a complaint would be written up.	1/28/2003	CS indicated that supervisor monitored the call & CA had done nothing wrong. Customer was abusive with CA and supervisor and was transferred to CS. Met with CA & discussed situation. No contact information given.
2/1/2003	Customer felt CA took 3 minutes to reply to a statement typed and CA was abusive. CS apologized for any misunderstandings that may have occurred.	2/21/2003	No further action possible, CA followed proper procedures. No contact information given.
2/1/2003	CA sent alt 2 when customer asked for a supervisor. CA was immediately coached on what to do in this situation. CS apologized for the inconvenience	2/14/2003	CA coached immediately to beep for supervisor when requested by customer. No contact information given.
2/2/2003	Customer complained that supervisor Mary is evil and disrespectful and bullies him. He also stated that all CA's & supervisors discriminate against him. CS apologized to the customer for the inconvenience.	2/14/2003	Customer has a history of complaints towards good CA's. Frequently the OB person (his mom) hangs up on him then he gets angry. Not possible to pursue the resolution with this customer.
2/7/2003	Customer states the Relay supervisor was rude and insulted him. Supervisor would not give his/her name to customer. Customer advises the supervisor is insensitive to the deaf & should be disciplined. Customer says the supervisor owes him an apology.	2/11/2003	CS rep apologized for the frustration and advised that a complaint would be issued. Customer is know to filing frequent invalid complaints. Not possible to pursue the resolution with this customer.
2/7/2003	Customer states the relay supervisor was rude & insulted him. Supervisor would not give his/her name to customer. Supervisor used hostile words and customer further states that the supervisor hung up on him. Customer advises that the supervisor is insensitive to the deaf and should be disciplined. Customer says supervisor owes him an apology.	2/11/2003	CS rep apologized for the frustration this caused and advised that a complaint would be issued. Unable to verify which supervisor assisted with the call.

2/7/2003	Customer states CA did not follow his instructions. When he tried to correct the CA, supervisor came on and insulted him. Rep apologized for the frustration this caused and advised a complaint would be issued. No follow up requested.	2/11/2003	Unable to verify which supervisor assisted with the call. No further follow up possible. According to state, the customer is known to be filing invalid complaints. Not possible to pursue the resolution with this customer.
2/14/2003	Customer stated that the CA had used bad language toward the customer. Supervisor apologized & attempted to learn the nature of the customer's complaint. Customer did not provide issue specifics used profanity toward the supervisor and demanded an apology for everything that would happen with the relay services through the yr 2004. Supervisor attempted another apology & offered to provide the customer the WA AM ph number if the customer had problems that the supervisor could not correct at this time. Customer continued to use profanity and then disconnected.	2/14/2003	A review of the conversation typed by CA revealed that the CA had made no inappropriate remarks to the customer. Customer had interrupted macro transmission saying person hung up. Supervisor determined that the CA had followed protocol when processing the call. No coaching required. No contact information given
2/17/2003	Customer complained that CA took a long time to respond after they sent GA. Apologized to the customer for the inconvenience & advised customer that the complaint would be forwarded to the proper dept. No follow up requested.	2/24/2003	Met with CA & CA stated that the delay was related to the voice customer not responding. Coached CA on the importance of responding in a timely manner and to keep customer informed. Advised CA that if voice person is not responding, CA should inform TTY customer and wait for further instructions, also to prompt the voice person once for a GA. No contact information given.
2/21/2003	Customer stated that earlier today they had made a several calls. They started at 3:20p with one CA 9343 at 3:35p there was another CA 9446 that came on screen without the usual "agent continuing call". CA 9446 typed slow with many pauses and there were two hang-ups. Apologized to the customer & assured that the CA would be coached	2/25/2003	Met with CA who was currently in training at the time the complaint was made. Coached CA on the proper call procedures. The importance of processing calls to customer's satisfaction was emphasized. No contact information given.

2/28/2003	Customer stated that he asked the CA to leave a message on an answering machine. Customer provided 2 nd number (cell ph) and asked the CA to leave the same message on both answering machines. CA informed customer that he is not allowed to leave the same message on two different numbers. Apologized to customer & told him that there was no procedure that prohibits leaving the same message on two different numbers. Informed him that this complaint would be fwd to the appropriate center for follow up.	4/30/2003	CA was following proper procedure. Unable to reach customer, no contact info provided.
3/1/2003	WA STS customer stated that there has been a long wait time to get a STS CA. Customer reached a recording first, then heard TTY tones & finally had a long ring time. Customer wanted to make Relay aware of the hold time in order to check STS staffing & gate accordingly. Customer wanted a call back about the issue & would like to be called on Monday 3/3/03 between 10a – 6p (pst). During this time, 9:40a Supervisor observed 3 STS CA's busy with calls. After customer contact 3 STS CA's were available.	4/18/2003	AM emailed customer & informed him that the actual call volume at that time was greater than the forecasted call volume. Staff levels are being adjusted. Customer appreciated the follow-up.
3/1/2003	Customer upset that CA 4075F hung up on them. CA impolite ignored request asked CA question about caller opinion 5 times and then disconnected the caller. Customer asked what Sprint will do about CA. Told supervisor to tell CA to go home, mistreat customer deaf is not funny. Customer feels confused and abused. Customer says CA breaks job rules. TL apologized to customer for any inconvenience and would forward complaint. Customer requested follow up	3/6/2003	TL spoke with CA who said she didn't hang up on anyone; she was not rude to anyone. She remembers a tty customer who was angry with her for not communicating with him after call had ended by typing "CA not allowed to engage in conversation" after the customer asked personal questions. CA followed relay procedures. TL then called customer & said he would keep an eye on the CA. The customer seemed satisfied.

3/1/2003	Customer upset that CA 2191F hung up on them. CA impolite ignored request asked CA question about caller opinion 5 times and then disconnected the caller. Customer asked what Sprint will do about CA. Told supervisor to tell CA to go home, mistreat deaf customer is not funny. Customer feels confused and abused. Customer says CA breaks job rules. TL apologized to customer for any inconvenience and would forward complaint. Customer requested follow up	3/6/2003	Center Manger pulled report that determined the CA did not hang up on the caller. TL tried 9 times to call customer for follow up and could not contact customer.
3/14/2003	Customer stated that she had a difficult call through relay CA 9067 when she received a call the previous day. CA was very nice, polite, trying very hard, but because of her strong foreign accent and lack of good spoken English skills the communication was much more difficult that it normally should be. Customer also states that she had to spell simple English words to this CA and had to go extra, extra slow. Customer felt CA was not qualified for this job. QA rep informed customer that is complaint would be forwarded to CA's supervisor.	3/27/2003	Met with CA regarding the complaint & CA did not recall the situation in question. CA speaks only English and does not have an accent. While speaking with CA, it was apparent that CA spoke English clearly. CA does not have a "strong foreign accent", nor is there a problem with her communications skills. However, CA was coached on the importance of speaking clearly pronouncing each word properly while relaying, which aids in providing quality customer service. Emailed customer on 4/11/03 to inform customer that supervisor met with CA & discussed issues.
3/19/2003	STS Customer called and wanted to know why, when the STS CA's are all busy and his call goes to a recording, why does the recording start with TTY tones. He would like them removed. He would like a return call regarding this problem with STS.	3/19/2003	AM emailed customer & informed him that the actual call volume at that time was greater than the forecasted call volume. Staff levels are being adjusted. Customer appreciated the follow-up.
3/28/2003	Customer told CA 6302 to dial number and if answering machine answers he wanted to leave a message. CA dialed out & got recording then hung up on customer. Supervisor apologized for poor service and processed call for customer.	3/31/2003	Supervisor reviewed proper procedures with CA. No contact information to follow up with customer.

4/2/2003	Customer asked CA4585F to call her voice mail and retrieve new messages. CA relayed first message, customer then asked CA to redial & delete first message and type second message to her. CA redialed voice mail & typed to customer that she accidentally deleted both messages. Customer states she is upset with the CA error. Customer advises that she runs a business & depends on voice mail. CS apologizes to customer & advised that the supervisor would be notified.	4/7/2003	Supervisor spoke with CA & said that after CA deleted the 1 st message she heard TTY tones on the 2 nd message so she accidentally deleted that message. Supervisor spoke with customer & informed her that the CA was coached for the mistake. Customer indicated that she was satisfied.
4/17/2003	Customer thinks frequently dialed numbers list should hold more numbers. Customer wants CS to please mail him a copy of his customer profile. He also wants to be called back regarding the Frequently dialed numbers capacity problem.	5/28/2003	CS informed customer that info would be forwarded to Customer Service & AM. WA FCC compliance officer attempted to contact customer on 3 separate dates and left detailed message to call back.
5/1/2003	Customer wanted supervisor to express an opinion on content of a previous call. Supervisor explained that he had no opinion to share. Supervisor asked if there was anything else that we could assist customer with. Customer said no, thanks & hung up.	5/01/2003	No CA # & No contact information
5/5/2003	Customer gave CA 9462F number to dial out; he waited & waited with no response. Typed Hello, Hello, still no response. Told Ca he wanted supervisor & still no response. The he hung up & called back indicating he "wants a letter". QA rep apologized to customer & assured him this would be documented. Also assured customer that the appropriate supervisor would be notified & send him a confirmation letter that he requested.	5/8/2003	Met with CA, who indicated she has no recollection of the call. Coached CA on the importance of responding to calls in a timely manner. Advised CA that a supervisor must be summoned when a customer is requesting to speak with one. Also advised CA that appropriate action would be taken when not following customer request or not requesting a supervisor for the customer. WA FCC compliance officer attempted to contact customer, recording indicated that the phone number had been disconnected. Sent a letter of resolution to customer.

5/12/2003	CA 9563F entered wrong extension number. Customer corrected CA & redialed and told CA to ask for a specific person. Customer waited 2 minutes without response from CA. Customer then requested a different CA to process the call. QA mgr apologized for the inconvenience and advised that the complaint was documented	5/16/2003	Met with CA who indicated that she did not remember the call. Advised CA to always keep the customer informed. Coached CA on making sure when the information is given, it is entered correctly. Had Ca review procedures, which she was able to do without any problems. No contact information for follow-up.
5/12/2003	A Domestic Violence Agency called CS to report that they had received a call from a TTY caller through the relay service. They stated that a TTY caller had called through the relay and CA 5995 or 5955 had processed the call kept muting his headset and even forgot to do so several times and she could hear him laughing. They also wanted Relay to know that domestic violence is a serious problem and is no laughing matter. She also stated that the CA was very unprofessional & offensive.	6/16/2003	QAR contacted customer and advised that the center indicated in the complaint did not have a particular CA with that ID number but QAR would coach all CA's on proper procedures for sensitive topics. FCC compliance Officer contacted customer on 6/17/03 to follow up with solution & to explain the need for the correct CA # to follow up with CA involved.
5/14/2003	Customer stated that she received a call from her daughter at school and could not understand a word CA said, CA did not communicate clearly the requested CA to repeat because she could not understand CA and CA refused. Customer stated to CA that is very difficult for her young daughter to use TDD & CA typed that info to the customer's daughter. Customer was very upset that her young daughter read that info and felt it would affect her negatively by that statement.	5/29/2003	WA FCC compliance officer attempted to contact customer on 3 separate dates leaving message with contact information. Customer has not called back to this date. No CA # given.
5/20/2003	Customer called not to complain about CA, but a technical complaint. When tell CA to dial FD list the first # on the list is entered & automatically dialed list does not show up. This is upsetting to customer as well as bothering people he hadn't intended to call.	6/16/2003	Technician reviewing the issue & was unable to duplicate the problem. Suspected that the CA may have typed "FD" + enter. This would automatically select the first FD number on the list. AM sent email to customer with the result on 6/16/03 who replied on 6/17/03 indicating that he was satisfied with the solution.

5/21/2003	Customer stated CA 9616F took down personal information and threatened them.	5/22/2003	CA 9616F was not scheduled to work on date of complaint. CS reviewed tracking system and there was no CA logged in under this ID #. Without additional Info or ID number the complaint cannot be resolved. No contact information provided.
5/22/2003	Customer stated she asked CA 9138F to repeat because she could not understand her. CA refused & kept on asking called to repeat. Customer stated that she was not able to understand CA due to her strong accent. Customer would like call back with results.	5/22/2003	Met with CA who stated that she did remember the pacing the customer once, but the customer never asked her to repeat. CA does not have an accent, but was congested due to being sick. Coached CA on proper way to pace the customer & advise that she follow customers request. Called the above number and was informed that no one lived there under that name.
5/27/2003	Customer stated that her husband made a call to her that evening indicating that CA 4650M answered call. Customer states that husband said "Hi Honey, I got your mail, and she wanted me to get other than milk". Customer interjected to the CA, "what mail". CA spelled again & said "mail" for "milk" incorrectly. CA misspelled this twice and finally my husband yelled at CA. Customer told CA that "I didn't blame husband for yelling and for the CA to do his damn job & interpret correctly. Customer says she has had enough of the crap. This is sickening that you can't even have a reliable CA who will spell correctly. Almost 98% does not spell right & expect us to assume that we know what they are talking about."	6/1/2003	TL spoke with CA who remembered the call. CA stated that the male voice was difficult to understand. When customer questioned whether he meant milk or mail, the voice person yelled because it was questioned. CA did not register he was being yelled at, though the person had raised his voice for the CA to understand. TL discussed with CA how it is ok to say, please repeat or even to ask for something to be spelled. CA did correct procedure. FCC compliance officer emailed customer on 6/25/03 for follow up and satisfaction of solution.

**Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
State of Washington
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Washington Relay Telecommunications Services
Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
CC Docket No. 98-67
June 30, 2004**

Acronym Log
CA: Communication Assistant
QAR: Quality Assurance Rep
TL: Team Leader
CS: Customer Service
ODHH: Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/3/2003	The customer complained that CA stated she could not hear voice person and disconnected the call. Customer requested follow-up.	11/10/2003	No CA number provided – ODHH attempted to contact customer on 9/22/03, customer indicated she would call back at noon that day. 11/10/03 – tried to leave message on answering machine, CA indicated that answering machine will not allow messages to be left.
6/13/2003	Customer was not happy that CA 9080M always interrupting while customer typed. Customer requested follow-up	7/15/2003	CA stated that he didn't remember call, but stated he would not intentionally interrupt customer. CA was coached on proper procedures to follow, when voice customer is talking while the TTY user is typing. Sprint contacted customer on 7/15/03 who indicated he was satisfied with solution. ODHH sent a follow up email to ensure that he was satisfied with the solution.
6/19/2003	Customer complained that his was unable to reach toll free number available only inside of WA state. Customer was informed that he could not make the call from the number he was calling from. Customer explained that his hearing friend standing next to him could reach the number without relay. Tried calling through SRO & got same message. CA handling call: CA4290. Customer requested follow-up.	9/22/2003	Sprint technicians investigated trouble ticket and found that the toll free number was regional restricted to LATA 674 & 678. This covers most of Washington State. Customer lives in LATA 672 which covers Oregon and a small part of Southern Washington. Sprint contacted customer on 8/28/03 with information regarding LATA issue. ODHH contacted customer on 9/22/03 who indicated that she understood the tech issues related to the LATA and was satisfied with the explanation.
6/26/2003	No CA number provided – Customer complained that trainers are not adequately training CA's regarding the frequently dialed numbers and how to access customer notes.	6/26/2003	Assured customer that the training dept will be informed. The customer database is part of the New Hire curriculum and CA's are given hands-on practice to ensure comfort level. No contact information provided.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/27/2003	Customer complained that CA 9507F hung up on caller	7/8/2003	Met with CA who stated that she did not remember call, but would not hang up on a customer. Coached CA on proper procedures to follow when a call needs to be disconnected, also consequences of hanging up on a customer. No contact information provided.
6/27/2003	Customer waited a long time without a response from CA 9537F.	7/10/2003	Reviewed Rockwell reporting and discovered that the CA's ID number was not logged into the system at this particular time of the day. However, met with CA & did not remember the call. Coached CA on the importance of responding to customers in a timely manner. No contact information provided.
6/27/2003	Customer complained that CA 9353F did not adjust her mic, which caused her customer to hang up.	7/2/2003	Met with & coached CA on the importance of adjusting microphone volume to ensure that she can be heard. No contact information provided.
7/1/2003	Customer complained that CA 6308F was very rude and uncooperative during her call.	7/22/2003	Supervisor met with CA to review complaint and discuss proper procedures. No contact information provided.
7/14/2003	Customer complained that she was not told who was trying to call them. She asked CA 9458F to tell her who was calling and customer stated that the CA was rude & unprofessional and would not let her know any information about the caller.	7/14/2003	QAR met with CA. CA remembered and documented the call. Based on the information provided, the CA followed proper call procedures. No contact information provided.
7/23/2003	Customer complained that there were too many typing errors. Customer received many zeros & question marks. Supervisor observed CA 6501's screen and there was no garbled text with minor errors.	7/23/2003	TL told customer that supervisor observed that there were only minor errors. TL asked customer if they were receiving garbled text. CA followed proper procedures. No contact information provided

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
7/23/2003	Voice customer offers legal services with several regional 800 numbers and is unable to receive any calls via relay. Customer reports that she and her customers dialing from different inbound numbers and are unable to connect to these lines. Customer also tried SRO and it will not connect either.	07/29/2003	Sprint technicians investigated trouble ticket and found that the toll free number was regional restricted to LATA 674 & 678. This covers most of Washington State. Customer lives in LATA 672 which covers Oregon and a small part of Southern Washington. Sprint CS tech contacted customer on 7/29/03 regarding LATA technical issues.
7/24/2003	Customer complained that CA 7601F did not follow instructions – had to call back, did not speak loud enough and would not repeat.	7/28/2003	TL met with CA who remembered call. TL checked CA knowledge of procedure and CA knows to repeat last GA. CA indicates that they called a TL over to observe call. OB voice wanted CA to turn up volume and CA did so. 2 nd TL observed CA and says that CA typed what outbound said about repeating and inbound TTY thought CA was not repeating. TL advised CA to follow inbound instructions. No contact information provided.
7/27/2003	TTY customer received a message on their TTY answering machine from this CA 9754M that was garbled. Customer was very upset and demanded to receive his msg.	7/24/2003	CA did not remember the call. There seemed to be a technical issue which caused the message to appear garbled on the customers tty when message was left. No contact information provided.
8/1/2003	Customer Complained that CA 9517 did not follow instructions. The customer asked CA not to announce relay but the CA gave her ID #.	8/5/2003	Coached CA on procedures to follow when customer does not want to announce call. Advised CA that since CA # is part of the announcement to always ask the customer how they wish to have the call announced and follow the customer's request. No contact information provided.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
8/3/2003	Customer complained that CA 6051M gave them two different messages from voice mail with 2 different names that were incorrect and typed the wrong phone number.	9/22/2003	Coached CA on using record feature – if recording is muffled use (recording unclear) or (recording muffled). ODHH contacted customer on 9/22/03 – customer satisfied with solution.
8/3/2003	Customer complained that CA 9597 gave them two different messages from voice mail with 2 different names that were incorrect and typed the wrong phone number.	8/4/2003	Coached CA on phone image when leaving a message on an answering machine. Also coached CA on typing everything heard and not omitting content of the call and the consequences of doing so. CA advised to speak clearly, making sure that each word is pronounced with clarity. ODHH contacted customer on 9/22/03 – customer satisfied with solution.
8/18/2003	Customer complained that CA 9957F did not follow the correct procedures when dialing an 800 number.	8/26/2003	Although CA did not remember this particular call, she was coached on the proper procedures to follow when processing a call that uses an 800 number and the call does not go through. CA also went through one on one refresher procedure. Sprint contacted customer on 8/28/04 who indicated she was satisfied with the resolution.
8/21/2003	Customer complained that the CA 4137F did not follow instructions. CA was asked to hang up on any answering machine and instead typed out the entire recording.	11/10/2003	CA indicated that her instructions to redial over and over left her surprised when the phone was answered by a machine instead of a busy signal. CA forgot and typed answering machine. ODHH contacted customer on 9/22/03 – not home, 11/10/03 – mother answered phone & left message for customer. 1/20/04 – no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
8/23/2003	Customer complained that the CA 9588F was talking while processing the call. Customer had requested a different CA and would like to have this CA retrained on how to give better service.	8/24/2003	Met with CA and coached CA on always being professional at all times. CA advised that talking on a call is not acceptable and of the consequences of talking while processing calls. Sprint CS contacted customer on 8/26/04 who stated that she was satisfied that the situation was handled in a timely manner.
8/25/2003	Customer complained while placing a call to his mom, he informed CA 6313F to hold while he looked for another number to dial. The CA was interrupted and the caller stated again to please hold and don't interrupt. Customer alleges that the CA then typed "fuck you" and hung up.	9/30/2003	ODHH contacted Customer on 9/30/03 and attempted to explain TRS relay process during conversation. Customer would talk about issues not related to complaint. ODHH unable to identify whether customer was satisfied with resolution.
8/28/2003	Customer complained that he was upset because the CA 6502 did not tell him how the voice person sounded during the conversation.	9/4/2003	Coached CA on using descriptive words to inform customer of voice person's tone of voice. Sprint made 3 attempts to contact customer: 8/29/03, 9/3/03, & 9/4/03 - no answer.
8/29/2003	Customer complained that CA 8503M hung up on him without redialing.	9/3/2003	CA made an honest mistake disconnecting the call. CA coached to be more careful when disconnecting the call. Sprint made 3 Attempts to contact customer: 9/2/03-5pm, 9/3/03-10:55am, 9/3/03-2:30pm - No answer.
9/5/2003	TTY customer frustrated at CA 4382F. When customer placed a call to relay, CA repeatedly asked nbr calling to please after customer gave it several times.	9/8/2003	Spoke with CA, call came in as unbranded. CA sent macro asking for nbr to be called after no typed response. CA opened headset connection and heard VCO user's voice and processed call. CA followed correct procedure. Sprint contacted customer on 9/8/03 who stated she was satisfied.
9/23/2003	Customer complained that CA 6570 did not type everything voice person said.	9/23/2003	Coached CA on the importance of typing everything heard to the customer. No contact information provided.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
10/13/2003	Customer complained that after requesting a live person on the phone CA 7853F informed Customer that they were on hold waiting for next available agent. Customer asked CA to hang up & call back again. CA did as customer requested and hung up. Customer said CA said that a Customer rep had come on the line. Customer was upset that CA hung up on customer rep before telling customer that customer rep was online.	10/15/2003	Customer requested supervisor and supervisor upheld CA's action as he felt CA was following customer's instructions. CA was coached on correct procedures for following customer instructions exactly as told. Discussed proper feedback procedures with supervisor. Sprint emailed customer on 10/15/03 with solution who replied on 11/17/03 that she was satisfied with solution.
10/25/2003	Customer asked for a frequently dialed number and the CA did not understand what he was talking about. Customer felt that this CA was not aware of the frequently dialed list and needs to be coached on this procedure.	10/25/2003	Complaint did not have CA #. Without additional information QA is unable to resolve this complaint. No customer contact information provided.
10/28/2003	Voice customer was upset because he called his wife who is a VCO user and said that CA 1534 was rude. CA asked female if she could hear, and she said yes, CA said this person can call you direct and disconnected. Customer said his wife can hear some but not well so uses VCO phone and was upset that CA said to call direct.	10/28/2003	Got another CA to complete the call for the voice customer. Spoke with CA and she stated that outbound person said "can I use VCO" but the female was responding to the CA and CA was confused about whether the person speaking was the voice user or if the VCO wasn't there. CA was coached on procedure if person asks for VCO and demonstrated knowledge of VCO call handling. No customer contact information provided.
10/30/2003	Customer asked CA 3869F to dial number, CA would not dial number. This situation occurred with three (3) different CA's (6137F & 4104) at the same time.	10/30/2003	CA does not remember call. Coached CA on dialing out procedures. No customer contact information provided.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
10/30/2003	Customer said CA 7666M did not type clearly at the point that she hung up and called back with another CA.	11/7/2003	CA indicated that voice person had 4-5 syllable words and voice person would not spell them. CA was coached on asking for clarification while typing clearly and following verbatim of conversation. ODHH contacted customer on 11/7/03 who stated that she was satisfied with the solution.
10/30/2003	Customer asked to dial nbr, CA 3869F would not.	11/3/2003	There is not a CA in this center with that ID number. Unable to follow up with CA. No further action possible. No contact information.
10/30/2003	Customer asked to dial nbr, CA 4104 would not dial number.	11/3/2003	Unable to follow up with the CA as there is no CA assigned to that ID number. No further action possible. No contact information provided.
11/6/2003	Customer complained that CA 9390F did not relay message to voice person.	12/9/2003	CA was coached on the importance of following customer request at all times. CA was also advised to make sure that she remains focused and professional. Contacted customer and advised regarding solution. Customer was satisfied with solution. ODHH contacted customer on 12/9/03 – customer satisfied with solution.
11/11/2003	Customer said that CA 3814 made fun of him and did not explain what happened after the person he called hung up on him. Expressed that CA was lazy and mistreated him.	11/11/2003	CA called relay center manager (mgr) over when the caller began to directly abuse her after the caller's party had hung up. Due to the way in which caller began to type obscenities towards CA. Mgr took over the call and one moment in which the caller stated that I (mgr) was foolish due to silence on continued to use vulgar words. The call went on in great lengths before I (mgr) was able to defuse the situation.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/11/2003	VCO Customer called to complaint that people could not hear him through the relay. No CA # given.	4/2/2003	Trouble ticket was issued by Sprint relay. Customers garbling issue is related to a known problem with VCO calls through the TRS platform. Sprint sent email to customer on 4/2/04 with information on new TRS platform that will improve VCO calls. ODHH contacted customer on 4/24/04 and left message regarding solution and contact information to call back.
12/11/2003	Customer upset that CA 6533M did not respond. Customer asked to speak with a Supervisor, when supervisor got on the phone customer asked after explaining situation if supervisor understood. Before supervisor responded customer interrupted and upset about the delay. Tried to apologize but customer interrupted and then hung up.	12/11/2003	Discussed situation with CA and reviewed CA's screen print. CA had done everything according to customer request. No customer contact information provided.
12/26/2003	Customer indicates that he gave CA 9806F phone number to dial twice but CA never responded. Customer had to wait for a long time.	4/23/2004	Discussed complaint with CA, CA stated that they were having technical difficulties at the time. Supervisor advised CA to alert Supervisor when experiencing technical difficulties. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer 2/23/04, 3/2/04, 4/23/04 – no answer.
1/4/2004	This customer has had various complaints. Customer complained CA 4241F abused and called him names. Complained about service and moments of silence, CA being slow. Customer was not understanding the term used by CA.	3/16/2004	TL assisted with call and observed that there was no evidence of abuse by CA. CA stated that outbound caller hung up on TTY caller, he then asked what the outbound caller's voice tone sounded. CA sent the macro (CA no longer has info) he was angry & verbally abused CA and Assistant supervisor. CA did the correct procedure. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 3/4/04, 3/9/04, & 3/16/04 – no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
1/8/2004	Customer has been calling relay mornings between 8-9am her time. For the past week she has not been able to get through to a CA.	1/20/2004	For the month of January Sprint relay missed nine (9) daily weighted service levels for the state of Washington. This was due to increased call traffic volume as well as severe inclement weather.
1/17/2004	Customer called to say that CA 4199M was rude, called him names and hung up on him.	3/16/2004	CA stated that the caller wanted to leave message on answering machine & left message. Then caller asked if number was blocked, CA responded “no”. CA disconnected caller after 3 minutes with no number or respond. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 3/4/04, 3/09/04, & 3/16/04 – no answer.
1/17/2004	Customer called to indicate that CA 4070M was rude and called them names. Caller said CA disconnected them and talked to their party.	1/22/2004	Met with CA who had no recollection of any unusual calls that might have generated this complaint. CA is regularly monitored for compliance with policy and procedures. No contact information provided.
2/6/2004	Customer was very upset and stated that he called the center two different times and the CA hung up on him. No contact information provided.	2/10/2004	Met with CA concerning complaint. CA stated that as the TTY user typed the number to him the line disconnected. He aid that he got the call a second time and the same thing happened again. Coached CA on the importance of keeping the customer informed and reporting technical problems. CA advised of the consequences of disconnecting a call.
2/19/2004	Customer complained that CA 6629M hung up while speaking with mother. Customer said “CA was rude and when I typed to my mom the red dot on TTY was blinking, looked like CA hung up on him.” Customer typed to relay to redial and CA didn’t redial and hung up without informing customer.	4/12/2004	Coached CA on correct disconnection procedures. Called customer and advised them the CA had been coached. CS contacted customer on 2/26/04 – ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 4/6/04 & 4/12/04 – no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
2/20/2004	SRO Customer reports continual problems with calls being disconnected, most recently with CA 8184. Customer was calling a computer company to resolve a issue and after 20 minutes call was disconnected. Customer reported CA typed “you have been disconnected”.	2/20/2004	CA was pulled for discussion. Outbound party hung up on inbound, not the CA which was reason why the CA typed “you have been disconnected”. No contact information provided.
2/27/2004	Customer called relay to process an 888 number in Washington state. CA 9167M reached a recording that said “you have placed your call from a telephone which has calling restrictions or you have dialed a number that cannot be reached.” Customer wants to know why she cannot dial an 888 number through relay.	4/26/2004	Met with CA to discuss call, he indicated that when he attempted to call the regional 800 number he reached the same recording than he had received when dialing the number without the regional 800. CA was sent through a refresher course on regional 800 and practiced processing regional 800 calls. ODHH contacted customer on 4/26/04 – who was satisfied with the solution
3/1/2004	Customer complained that CA 2485F had a difficult time typing what voice recording said and did not type anything from the voice recording. Customer felt that CA should not be working as a relay CA if she has problems listening to a voice recording.	4/26/2004	TL Spoke with CA regarding the importance of relaying the entire message. The record feature was not working properly at the time, so CA typed to caller (missed part of recording). ODHH contacted customer on 4/26/04 – who was satisfied with the solution.
3/1/2004	Voice customer complained that CA 2149 repeatedly asked her to “(wait) just a minute”, her typing speed was terribly slow and customer indicates that she spoke very slow because she has the same experience every time she receives a call through WA relay.	4/26/2004	CA was coached on typing speed and focus on the call process. ODHH contacted customer on 4/26/04 who indicated that she was satisfied with the solution.
3/1/2004	Customer called to complaint that CA 3809 called him a dumb crazy deaf blind before hanging up on customer.	5/10/2004	CA stated that caller was cursing at her, CA called supervisor and Supervisor handled call. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 5/8/04, 5/9/04 & 5/10/04 – no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
3/12/2004	Customer felt that this CA 1390F was rude and was attempting to transfer to supervisor and disconnected the call.	3/12/2004	CA was instructed to ask if it's OK to be transferred to customer service. CA did not attempt to disconnect caller. No contact information provided.
3/15/2004	TTY caller got cut off in the middle of a call to the hospital with CA 9480F. Wondered why this happened?	3/15/2004	CA stated that the monitor went blank in the middle of the call. CA also documented the incident. CA advised to notify Team manager when experience technical difficulties. No contact information provided.
3/23/2004	Customer said CA 9058F was rude and would not repeat operator number when asked. Customer was talking to Mom who is a VCO user.	3/25/2004	Met with CA and after reviewing call, CA followed proper procedures by not repeating the message, because GA had already been said. Coached the CA that when either party request her CA number, it should be provided as long as she keeps the other party informed, and it does not interrupt the flow of the conversation. No contact information provided.
3/23/2004	Customer complained that supervisor Eunice was rude and hung up on customer.	3/29/2004	Customer was cursing at supervisor; supervisor tried a couple of times to calm him down. Customer continued cursing and being rude at supervisor, supervisor then disconnected customer. Prior to this customer did the same thing to CA then asked for supervisor. No Contact information provided.
3/24/2004	TTY customer expressed concern that relay CA 1372F did not follow correct procedures in keeping the customer informed during the call.	6/1/2004	Met with CA and went over steps that were missed. CA remembered call and understands all steps that need to be relayed. ODHHS contacted customer on 6/1/04 and customer indicated that she understood the situation and was satisfied with the solution.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
4/11/2004	Customer upset because relay CA 9163M used no vocal inflection at all. There was no emotion relayed and the call was very "blah". Customer asked to speak with a supervisor and call was disconnected. Customer did say she was the Outbound on call and Inbound had hung up.	5/26/2004	Met with CA, who stated that the line disconnected automatically since the TTY user had already hung up. CA was coached on relaying in a conversational tone and natural voice inflections when relaying. ODDH contacted customer on 5/26/04 who indicated she was satisfied with solution.
4/11/2004	Customer indicated that CA 9476F was rude and hung up on customer.	5/24/2004	Unable to meet with CA due to CA ID number unassigned at the time. No contact information provided.
4/23/2004	Customer stated that CA 6609F was rude, lazy and disrespectful of deaf. CA ignored customer when customer tried to get a reply 5 times from CA.	5/3/2004	Team Leader spoke with both CA & supervisor assisting on the call. Customer had stated to CA with no Outbound online that customer was going to commit suicide. Per procedures supervisor dialed 911. CA not at fault. Sprint sent letter to customer 5/3/2004.
4/26/2004	Customer was unhappy with the CA 3648F's many typo's and the use of XXX's. Also CA did not respond to the customer have a nice day comment, just gave sk sk.	6/6/2004	Unable to follow up with the CA in this center as there are no agents in this center with the ID number the customer provided. Tried to contact customer several times and the answering machine disconnected. No further action possible.
4/27/2004	Customer said CA 6618F made him hold for 90 minutes before dialing out and called him names.	4/27/2004	Supervisor had observed call, call time had only lapsed 45 minutes. CA followed all proper procedures. No contact information provided.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/1/2004	TTY customer complained of silence and the long delay when the "GA" was given before voice text was typed.	6/10/2004	CA stated that the outbound customer disconnected because TTY customer was typing very long messages. When CA started typing the voice message the TTY customer would interrupt throughout the call. Coached CA on keeping the customer informed at all times and to make sure that her response time was not slow in relaying the messages. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer, 6/8/04, 6/9/04, 6/10/04 no answer.
5/3/2004	Voice customer indicated that CA 6488M did not answer question and kept typing to TTY answering machine. Customer wanted CA to let him know that no one responded. Wants to make sure all CA's let him know when tty user responds or picks up. Another general complaint wants CA's that cover states to be familiar with slang and directions.	5/11/2004	TL followed up with CA and reviewed TTY answering machine process. Sprint sent letter to customer on 5/11/04 explaining that CA had been coached on proper procedures for TDD answering machines and stop keying.
5/4/2004	Voice customer receives message to call Allied and connects to Indiana Relay. Customer calling from number did not match the number he provided. CS referred customer to his local phone company – Qwest and agreed to enter a request for relay techs to look into it. CS explained that the number was not a current number for Indiana relay, but that it may have been at one time or a line may be crossed.	6/9/2004	Sprint technicians could not duplicate problem as reported. The 800 number in question is not a Sprint owned number. CS attempted to contact customer on 5/28/04, 6/2/04, 6/7/04 & 6/9/04. CS Left message on answering machine with contact information.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/5/2004	Customer complained that CA 3809 was slow in responding and then hung up on caller	6/10/2004	TL discussed with CA who stated that customer did not type "GA" then hung up. CA did not respond because customer did not type "GA". Informed CA not to hang up on anyone and to call TL when it happens again. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 6/8/04, 6/9/04 & 6/10/04 – no answer
5/6/2004	Customer asked CA 9043 to dial a toll free number which connected to an automated voice recording. Customer complained that CA could not relay proceedings of voice recording to customer. Customer also indicated that there were misspellings and CA had a difficult time handling the voice recording.	6/9/2004	QA rep met with CA, coached CA on staying focused when typing. Also reviewed recording and answering machine procedures. ODHH contacted customer on 6/9/2004 and customer was satisfied with solution.
5/11/2004	Customer gets a recording saying her LD calls cannot be processed. It only happens when her calls route through specific centers and she wants it fixed. Technical trouble ticket # issued	5/28/2004	Spoke with customer that tech was working in this. Tech gave information to her LD company so that they could troubleshoot problem. The recording is coming from her LD company, so it is determined to be a problem at their end. ODHH contacted customer on 5/28/04 regarding solution; customer indicated she was satisfied with the solution.
5/12/2004	Customer described CA6165F as very rude and did not follow customer notes to explain how mom sounded. Customer said CA called him dumb, stupid, crazy and laughed at him. Customer said CA repeated many times that they could not get involved to say how person sounded. Customer also said that there were long periods of silence with no typing so he didn't know what was going on.	6/10/2004	Spoke with CA, CA did not call customer names. Customer was abusive towards CA. CA followed all directions and procedures and called supervisor for help on the call. Reviewed proper procedures with CA. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact Customer on 6/8/04, 6/9/04 and 6/10/04 - no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/11/2004	Customer called and said she gets a recording saying that her long distance calls cannot be processed. This only happens when her call are routed through specific centers and wants it fixed.	5/28/2004	Trouble ticket was issued for this technical problem. Sprint tech contacted customer and provided information for her LD Co. so that they could troubleshoot the problem. Recording was coming from her LD Co and it's determined to be a problem at their end.
5/15/2004	Customer complained that supervisor Debbie is a lazy bad supervisor for not disciplining CA's. CA's do not keep customer informed. Debbie has a bad attitude & bad judgment & does not respect me.	6/10/2004	CA number provided by customer is currently unassigned. CA numbers given by customer are not currently assigned to any CA, therefore coaching of CA cannot be followed up. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact Customer on 6/8/04, 6/9/04 and 6/10/04 - no answer.
5/17/2004	Customer called to say that CA 4205F disconnected him in the middle of the call and that supervisor Aiesha was rude and broke Sprint rules. -	6/10/2004	QA Rep met with CA who stated that after the call was processed the TTY customer asked how the voice person sounded, which she answered. TTY customer then attempted to engage in conversation with CA about religion, the CA called supervisor over for assistance, which upset customer. When Supervisor Aiesha attempted to assist, the customer became upset and started to use profanity. After several attempts the supervisor disconnected due to customer using profanity. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 6/8/04, 6/9/04 and 6/10/04 – no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/18/2004	Voice customer is a switchboard Operator who indicated that she received 3 calls from the same CA 6055F whom she asked to hold but got no response and when she came back they had disconnected. The same CA called back and when she asked them to hold the CA said "you don't need to deal with those callers, you need to take this call." Customer also said CA corrected her spelling and felt this CA was needlessly rude.	5/20/2004	TL explained that it may have been the caller speaking to her as the CA's are not part of the conversation. Reviewed proper procedures with CA. No contact information provided.
5/20/2004	Customer complained that CA 4512M did not immediately respond to customers requests.	5/26/2004	TL met with CA who stated that the customer interrupted the ringing macro with a complaint about the CA doing his job. CA obtained team leader who stated there was no CA error. No contact information provided.
5/20/2004	Customer complained that CA 4212 did not immediately respond to customers requests.	5/24/2004	This CA # is currently un assigned. No contact information provided.
5/24/2004	Customer called to complain that CA 4699F was lazy and was silent. Customer also complained that CA was repetitive, foolish and was abusive.	6/10/2004	Ca vaguely remembers call. Per CA inbound caller kept directing conversation to CA saying things like "this is a terrible relay service". CA did not want to break transparency so relayed words and did not directly respond to caller. TL advised CA to next time call over a supervisor for assistance. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer were not answered. 5/26, 5/28 & 6/10/04

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/25/2004	Customer reported that he was placing a call and after the call was completed he requested CA 1288 how the voice person sounded. According to the customer the CA started swear at the customer. Customer felt that he was verbally abused by CA.	6/10/2004	TL checked screen and there were no indication that CA swore at customer. TL shared that information with the customer and then customer accused TL of being a liar. ODHH made 3 attempts to contact customer on 5/26/04, 5/28/04, 6/8/04, 6/9/04 & 6/10/04 with no answer. Sprint sent letter to customer on 6/10/04.

**State of Washington
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Washington Relay Telecommunications Services
Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
CG Docket 03-123
June 30, 2005**

Acronym Log

CA: Communication Assistant
QAR: Quality Assurance Rep
TL: Team Leader
CS: Customer Service
ODHH: Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/4/2004	CA 6082 processed a call for the customer, but did not process correct number. Customer asked for immediate credit; supervisor assisted agent in crediting customer. Supervisor attempted to contact ATT for credit transaction, but after a recording played, call hung up. Supervisor explained to customer that ATT could not be reached, but would call back with information after the tech looked into the problem. Trainer determined that the ATT operator would be unable to issue a credit, therefore relay was unable to assist customer with obtaining immediate credit for misdial.	6/10/2004	Supervisor called customer on 6/10/04, 10:55 am, 12:07 pm, and 1:56 pm, to inform customer as to what Tech found. No answer. CC closed because customer could not be reached.
6/14/2004	TTY customer said that CA 9085M had to redial several times when he got a company recording and it was frustrating to the caller. Requested a letter of apology for this CA's bad handling of his call.	11/3/2004	Apologized to the customer. This was the CA's first day taking live calls. During the call the trainer was giving feedback and instructing the agent on processing a recording with customer instructions. CA was pulled off line and had a one on one recording session with trainer. CA was receptive to the feedback and will be monitored by the trainer. No contact information for the customer was given.
6/16/2004	Customer complained that CA 9228 had very poor voice quality; sounded like bored and did not want to be at work. Apologized to customer.	6/18/2004	QAR met with CA, but did not remember call. QAR coached CA on the importance of always maintaining a conversational flow while voicing a message and showing a professional phone image during a call. No contact information for the customer was given.
6/16/2004	Customer complained that CA 9241 had very poor voice quality; sounded like bored and did not want to be at work. Apologized to customer.	6/18/2004	QAR met with CA, but did not remember call. QAR coached CA on the importance of always maintaining a conversational flow while voicing a message and showing a professional phone image during a call. No contact information for the customer was given.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/16/2004	Customer complained that CA 9120 had very poor voice quality; sounded like bored and did not want to be at work. Apologized to customer.	6/21/2004	QAR met with CA, but did not remember call. QAR coached CA on the importance of always maintaining a conversational flow while voicing a message and showing a professional phone image during a call. No contact information for the customer was given.
7/7/2004	Customer stated that CA 6450 informed the customer that the number provided was an invalid number.	7/7/2004	Called the number with no problems. Apologized to customer, forwarded to proper center for investigation. No contact information for the customer was given.
7/17/2004	TTY Customer called a business and indicated that CA 9342F did not type the correct business name and missed the message left on the answering machine. Customer felt CA was not trained well enough to handle the answering machine.	9/3/2004	ODHH forwarded complaint to Sprint to see if this is an issue with the CA unable to handle answering machines. Met with agent. Typing speed meets FCC requirements. Coached agent on typing verbatim, correcting all typing errors and verifying spelling of all words if not sure. Agent will be provided with additional training on answering machines and recordings. The agent will also be monitored daily to ensure compliance. ODHH contacted customer who was satisfied with the solution.
7/18/2004	CA 9644 reached voice answering machine and did not type out correct name. Customer asked if CA dialed correct number, CA did not respond. Call happened at 8:28 pm.	7/19/2004	QAR met with CA. CA stated that she typed the name she heard on the answering machine. At the end of the call the customer became upset and requested a supervisor. CA requested a supervisor but the customer hung up before supervisor arrived. CA coached on how to handle a call when unsure of what the answering machine is saying, advised to keep the customer informed. ODHH Called customer several times with no answer.
7/22/2004	TTY Customer called a business and indicated that CA 1664F did not type the correct business name and missed the message left on the answering machine. Customer felt CA was not trained well enough to handle the answering machine.	9/8/2004	ODHH forwarded complaint to Sprint on 7/23/2004 to see if this is an issue with the CA unable to handle answering machines. CA is experienced in typing recorded messages. Quality of recording may have been an issue. TL coached on importance of accuracy of typing all messages. ODHH contacted customer who was satisfied with solution.
8/2/2004	Voice customer asked CA 9093F to repeat who the TTY caller was asking for. CA was talking to co-worker and began laughing. Customer was offended and thought the CA was mocking her.	9/21/2004	QAR met with CA. CA stated that the area was loud, but that she would not laugh at the customer. Coached CA on remaining professional during every call. ODHH contacted customer with no answer.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
8/2/2004	TTY Customer called a number and CA 9270F missed part of the recorded voice message.	9/16/2004	QAR met with CA. CA understands how to process answering machines/recorded calls. Understands that any time the recording is unclear the customer must be notified and confirmed CA knows how to process answering machine calls. ODDH contacted customer who was satisfied with solution.
8/4/2004	CA 9241 hung up on caller. Apologized to customer and forwarded complaint to supervisor.	8/4/2004	QAR met with CA. CA state that she would not hang up on a customer. Advised CA of the consequences of hanging up on a customer and to inform a supervisor when experiencing technical difficulties or a call needs to be disconnected. No contact information for the customer was given.
8/5/2004	Customer was upset at CA's ability to transcribe what was said. CA had a difficult accent to understand and had trouble with simple words. When the customer asked for the CA #, the CA said "927" and hung up.	8/6/2004	Apologized to the customer and that the incident would be documented. Full CA number not given, so TL cannot follow up with CA. No contact information for the customer was given.
8/9/2004	Customer stated that she was hung up on 4 times prior to getting through to CA 3850F. However, CA 3850F took 20 minutes to process the call. Apologized to the customer, she requested follow-up call.	8/17/2004	TL reviewed HCO procedures with CA. Followed up with call to customer; customer returned call on 8/17 satisfied and happy.
8/12/2004	Customer stated that CA 9382M did not seem to like his job at all. No expression in his voice, ended the call rudely by saying "the party has hung up", when the customer thanked him he said, "Yeah." The customer has used relay many times and usually has a great experience, but this was the worst. Thanked the customer for the information and assured her the complaint would be investigated.	8/12/2004	QAR met with CA, he thought the customer wanted to commend him on his job performance. Coached CA on speaking clearly and never being rude to the customer. Advised CA that not being professional would not be tolerated. Due to the nature of the complaint, appropriate action will be taken. No contact information for the customer was given.
9/7/2004	Customer complained that CA 4741F left a message on an answering machine without the GA the customer typed first.	12/8/2004	Apologized to customer. Coached CA on waiting for the GA before leaving a message. No contact information for the customer was given.
9/10/2004	TTY user was frustrated that CA 4585F didn't type outgoing answering machine message. Instead, CA only typed "ANS MACH PLAYING," "ANS MACH HUNG UP."	12/7/2004	Apologized to customer. CA reported trouble with equipment. Customer stated that he would avoid 4xxx number agents and disconnected the call. Reminded agent to fully inform customer, including "Equipment problems, unable to type messages... would you like for relay to redial Q" or a similar, appropriate message. No contact information for the customer was given.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
9/11/2004	TTY user stated that CA 4020M disconnected before customer was finished typing. Informed customer that CA's direct supervisor would be informed.	9/28/2004	CA no longer with Relay; unable to coach.
9/13/2004	Customer complained that CAs 4316F, 4400F, 4413M, 4292M, 4285M, 4293F, 4249M, 4585F, 4228F, 4032M do not type out answering machine messages. They simply type "ans mach" or "recording playing then ans mach hung up."	9/17/2004	Five of the nine CA numbers are unassigned. The remaining CAs did not recall any calls with these details. They are aware of answering machine procedures and the consequences of not following those procedures.
9/15/2004	Customer complained that CA 9339 did not follow the customer's instructions.	12/7/2004	Apologized for the inconvenience. Met with CA, coached on the importance of always following the customer instructions/requests. No contact information for the customer was given.
10/1/2004	Customer reported that CA 2384F dialed a wrong number. Customer stopped CA and CA typed recording. Customer explained that CA dialed wrong number and asked to dial correct number. Customer was charged long distance and wants CA immediately disciplined.	12/15/2004	Thanked caller for feedback and apologized for the inconvenience. Advised caller to forward any charges to Sprint's CS department to issue credit. Report sent to the call center supervisor, issue addressed with the operator. Disciplinary action was taken. Emailed resolution to customer on 10/6/2004.
10/10/2004	TTY user explained MCI prepaid calling card. CA 9157M misunderstood and hung up on inbound.	12/15/2004	Lead apologized several times to customer and informed customer CA would be contacted. CA stated that pin number was invalid. Customer became upset when CA stated this, and caller disconnected. According to resolution, agent followed correct procedure. No contact information for the customer was given.
10/12/2004	Customer called a business with a recording that stated to press "0" for operator. Customer told CA 6311 to press 0; CA did not follow request. Redialed number and CA pressed 0 on second call.	11/2/2004	TL coached CA on making sure to stop when the TTY user begins to type in case the customer needs to convey a request, and to follow customer instructions. ODHHS contacted customer who was satisfied with solution.
10/13/2004	Customer stated that CA 9575 was mumbling. Customer requested that CA speak up, but she wouldn't. CA was also having a side conversation with another CA about gambling. Customer was very upset and had to tell the CA to have the caller call her back when CA would be more professional.	10/15/2004	QAR met with CA, she stated that the call was normal, but there were other CAs sitting in the same area. Coached on the importance of remaining professional and the consequences of talking during calls. No contact information for the customer was given.
10/15/2004	TTY user stated that while giving dialing instructions on a calling card, CA 9246 interrupted before customer finished instructions. Apologized for inconvenience.	10/19/2004	QAR met with CA. She accidentally pressed complete while customer was still providing the calling card number. Coached on being focused during calls. No contact information for the customer was given.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
10/26/2004	CA 9198F did not relay all call information to a customer. This resulted in a lack of communication between a parent and child. Customer also stated that it is vital that the CAs relay everything when it comes to children.	11/29/2004	QAR met with CA, she did not remember call. Coached agent on the importance of typing/relaying the conversation verbatim. Also advised the agent to verify directions and addresses. Contacted customer; customer is satisfied with solution.
10/27/2004	Customer requested CA 3806 to not type to TTY user. CA informed her “everything heard will be typed to caller.” Customer stated that she has never been told that everything heard would be typed back to the caller.	12/15/2004	Supervisor spoke with customer and reiterated that the CA is required to type everything the customer says and all background sounds to the TTY user for equal access purposes. Left 3 messages for customer with no call back: 5/16/05, 3:38 pm, 6/1/05, 2:25 pm, 6/14, 9:53 am.
12/5/2004	VCO customer reported that her VCO branding is no longer in place. The problem started on 12/3/2004 and continued through 12/5/2004. The customer reached CA’s 4032, 4289, 4141, 4108, 4040.	12/21/2004	Apologized for the problem. Internal update performed. Granddaughter satisfied with the resolution. Client experienced no further difficulties. ODHH contacted customer, no answer and left message.
12/28/2004	CA 4079F did not follow through after given a number to call. There was no response and caller does not want to pay for a call that was never completed.	12/28/2004	CA does not remember this call. CA coached on keeping the customer informed and to respond in a timely manner. ODHH called customer with result—customer is satisfied with the solution.
1/3/2005	Customer called AAA Emergency Road Service. CA 4142F missed recording message. On 1/4/05, customer called AAA to let them know their recorder doesn’t function properly. Amy Moreno with AAA checked the system and stated it was probably a technical problem on the other end.	6/21/2005	Agent number is not assigned at this time. ODHH email follow up sent to customer.
1/6/2005	Customer stated CA 4344F dialed out, received recording that number was changed. Customer requested agent to dial DA. Customer received ringing macro then line was disconnected.	1/6/2005	Apologized to customer. Discussed issues with HR, met with agent. Agent terminated. No contact information for the customer was given.
1/10/2005	Customer dialed St. Vincent de Paul’s. The woman who answered asked the customer to repeat her name and name of mobile home park. Customer isn’t sure if the woman was hard of hearing, the relay system malfunctioned, or CA 9207F did not speak clearly.	6/21/2005	Met with agent, agent does not remember the call. Coached agent on always voicing the caller’s message clearly and with a conversational tone. ODHH contacted customer via email regarding solution.
1/12/2005	Customer wanted CA 4163F to retrieve voice mail messages. CA tried and told customer there were TTY tones on the voice mail. Customer did not understand how that could be. CA hung up on customer.	1/13/2005	Apologized for inconvenience. CA number currently unassigned, further investigation is not possible. No contact information for the customer was given.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
1/12/2005	Customer wanted CA 4090M to retrieve voice mail messages. No response from CA and CA hung up.	1/19/2005	Apologized for inconvenience. CA was coached on importance of not disconnecting calls and advised of the consequences of doing so. No contact information for the customer was given.
1/17/2005	CA 3242 was instructed to call a VCO user and told that if a female answered, agent was to ask for a VCO user. CA did not follow instructions which resulted in outbound disconnecting.	1/17/2005	Apologized to customer. CA reminded of proper call processing procedures. No contact information for the customer was given.
1/20/2005	CA 3214 called a dealership and the receptionist accidentally dropped the phone and lost the call. Another person answered when the CA called back and began scolding the person for hanging up on her. Explained that it was the receptionist and the CA snapped back stating, "Yes, it was you. I recognize your voice, you slammed the phone on me."	1/21/2005	Spoke with CA about proper call procedures. CA said the receptionist became very angry and stated, "We are running a business here just like you are," never explaining that she'd dropped the phone. She said, "We didn't slam the phone on you," then transferred the call. No contact information for the customer was given.
1/30/2005	Customer gave CA 7395F a number to dial and CA said it was busy. Customer requested CA redial, then CA hung up on customer.	1/31/2005	The agent number identified is not assigned to any employee. The center was not open on the date indicated. Further investigation is not possible. No contact information for the customer was given.
2/7/2005	TTY user says she cannot make international calls through Relay. Verizon is her long distance and is in her database. Customer has called through CA's 6155, 4036, 4191. Advised customer to ensure with Verizon that she has an international calling plan. Also put in a TT.	2/7/2005	Not agent error. CA remembered call, tried to place call 3 times and each time got a recording stating that the call cannot be placed from the number she was calling from. CA typed recording and customer requested customer service.
2/10/2005	TTY customer unable to dial international number using COC Verizon. Customer has international plan with Verizon.	5/18/2005	TT IO02365812 opened. Spoke with customer and informed her that the problem is on Verizon's end. Technician called Verizon to have them open a ticket. Customer was appreciative and contacted Verizon to follow up.
2/10/2005	CA 4090M kept backing up and typing over words that were already typed. Customer did not know if it was CA or if her machine had a technical problem.	6/10/2005	Apologized to customer. CA did not remember the call. CA was reminded to report any technical difficulty that may occur with a call. Agents do not have the ability to back up and type on top of already printed words. If the agent backed up the only thing that would show to the TTY user would be "XXX". CA is no longer employed with CSD. Customer was satisfied with this solution.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
2/28/2005	Customer was extremely unhappy with service on a relay call. He asked the male agent to turn up the volume twice. Two minutes into the call, the agent switched to a female CA with a foreign accent. He asked her twice to turn up the volume. The CA was also unfamiliar with WA geography—customer had to spell “Seattle”, “Port Orchard” and “Lacey.”	3/31/2005	Apologized to customer. Advised that the supervisor would be notified. Assured customer that coaching would be provided. Met with CA 9436M and coached him on the proper procedures when being relieved from a call by another agent. Coached on the importance of voicing with clarity and accurate pronunciation. Complaint resolved on 3/7/05. ODHH contacted customer which resulted with complete satisfaction and respect for the relay service.
3/8/2005	Customer called and explained that she and others were unable to connect to Relay for 4-6 hours. 711 and the TTY number responded with a busy signal.	3/10/2005	Apologized to customer. Assured customer that the technical issue would be investigated and resolved. Since it is not possible to backtrack without customer contact information, unable to resolve this issue. No contact information for the customer was given.
3/9/2005	TTY customer waited 5-7 minutes for CA to dial out and CA never did.	3/30/2005	Apologized for the inconvenience. Assured customer everything was being documented and thanked him for taking the time to report the issue. Met with CA. CA did not remember the call. Coached CA on the importance of remaining focused and following the customer’s instructions promptly. No contact information for the customer was given.
3/14/2005	Customer stated that the caller ID feature was not working.	6/8/2005	Apologized to customer. Opened Trouble Ticket I002431417. Relay technician reports there was an issue with the ani.dat files updating on the call controllers for multiple centers. The login script for the cc has been updated and the ani.dat files are now updating. The cc’s had lost network connectivity due to a previous change which prevented the cc’s from connecting to either the x or y drives. ODHH contacted customer and explained situation—recommended contacting LEC. Customer was satisfied with solution and will contact LEC to solve problem.
3/19/2005	VCO customer stated that when she makes calls through Relay, her phone number dose not appear on the recipient’s caller ID.	3/19/2005	True caller ID turned on 3/8/2005. WA Relay no longer passes on the customer’s caller ID. The customer will need to work with their LEC to enable or disable caller ID. No contact information for the customer was given.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
3/19/2005	Customer stated that CA 8249 insulted and hung up on her.	3/19/2005	Thanked customer for taking the time to comment. Pulled CA for discussion. CA stated that she did not disconnect any caller. Reminded her that if she experienced any difficulty on any call that she should contact a supervisor immediately for assistance. No contact information for the customer was given.
3/28/2005	Customer commented that CA 1223F gave terrible service on his call. Words were misspelled and typed in a choppy, disconnected manner that made the conversation hard to follow. CA also misspelled the customer's name several times. Did not appear to be garbling, simply a CA error.	3/28/2005	Apologized for the problem and assured the customer that the complaint would be sent in, investigated and corrected. CA asked for proper spelling of VCO user's name from the outbound person, however, the outbound person said he didn't know how to spell it. CA spelled the name to the best of her ability. Voice caller was speaking quickly. CA was coached on proper pacing so that words won't be misspelled. No contact information for the customer was given.
4/4/2005	VCO customer called to complain that for the past three weeks her caller ID has not been transmitting through the relay. Other people use her phone without relay and the caller ID transmits just fine.	6/9/2005	Apologized for the problem. Customer needs to contact her local telephone company (LEC). After implementing SS7 on 3/8, stopped transmitting Caller ID through relay calls. There was an issue with the ani.dat files updating on the call. The login script for the CC has been updated and the files are now updating. ODHHS contacted Customer who was notified with an explanation of the change in service. Customer no longer has this problem and was happy to hear the reasoning.
4/10/2005	Relay did not answer a call placed to them—there was no answer or connection.	4/10/2005	Apologized to customer and thanked them for the feedback. CA was pulled for discussion. Believe the call was an ASCII call, which is the reason for no connection to the CA. CA reminded to contact a supervisor with any problem calls. No contact information for the customer was given.
4/18/2005	Customer said they asked CA 2066 how the person sounded. Customer asked three times and the CA did not respond. Customer suspects the CA disconnected both inbound and outbound lines.	6/9/2005	Customer was thanked and apologized to. CA was pulled for coaching. Was told that even if the call has ended, the CA can let the caller know how the other person sounded.
4/19/2005	Relay customer cannot place a call through Relay to her daughter—both living in Washington. She receives a message stating “The party you are calling does not accept blocked calls.”	6/27/2005	Apologized to customer. Opened TT IO02503128. Informed customer she needs to dial *82 then dial the 800 number for Relay for this call to go through.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
5/2/2005	Inbound VCO customer upset because the CA did not type “GA” so that he knew the voice caller was finished talking. This happened throughout the entire call. When the customer asked the CA about it, the CA replied that the voice caller never said “GA”.	5/3/2005	Explained that relay policy is to use “GA” and that the CA would be met with. Apologized for the frustration. Coached agent on the importance of using “GA”. She said the inbound was not using GA so she did not type it back. She apologized to the caller at the end of the call. No contact information for the customer was given.
5/4/2005	CA 1377F was rude to both the business and their customer. CA kept sighing during the call and would not convey the message as given.	5/4/2005	Thanked the caller and apologized for the poor service. Informed the supervisor of the situation. CA 1377F did not work on the day of the alleged incident. No contact information for the customer was given.
5/8/2005	Voice customer reported that she is connected to relay when she dials the number 671-1752.	5/8/2005	Apologized for the trouble. Explained that 711 is a shortcut number to the relay service. Suggested she contact her local phone company for further assistance. Opened TT#I002542442.
5/10/2005	VCO user stated CA 1772F dialed out and typed, “(RECORDING) (HOLDING...)”. Customer does not know why the recording was not typed out. Customer tried to interrupt agent by pressing spacebar and typed “Hey Relay...” CA did not acknowledge.	5/12/2005	Thanked caller. Said would forward to appropriate center for follow up. CA stated that VCO asked for “representative”—the reason the recording message was not typed. VCO typed and voice person answered the phone at the same time and CA was not able to immediately address the VCO user with the voice person on the line. CA followed proper protocol for not typing the recording message when a specific person is requested. No contact information for the customer was given.

State of Washington
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Washington Relay Telecommunications Services
Sprint Relay
Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
CG Docket 03-123
June 30, 2006

Acronym Log

CA: Communication Assistant
 QAR: Quality Assurance Rep
 TL: Team Leader
 CS: Customer Service
 ODHH: Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
06/13/05	Customer stated the agent placed a call but did not inform them if there was no answer or if the line was busy. Customer asked agent to redial and agent hung up. Apologized, informed complaint would be forwarded to the call center. No follow up requested.	06/13/05	CA said that she was not working any time near the time that this contact was prepared. She said she didn't have any calls like this and would never disconnect a customer.
06/25/05	WA TTY user was transferred to customer service by agent. Customer wanted to check their voice mail, customer gave agent all the instructions, instead of calling the voice mail for the customer, the agent transferred customer to customer service. Customer Service apologized to the customer. Customer does not want a follow up.	06/30/05	Met with agent stated the only call she remember transferring was when the caller wanted her to call his/her TTY number to check the equipment. She transferred this call to customer service because we do not provide this service. The caller did not ask her to check voice mail. Agent is aware of the importance of following instructions. No follow up requested.
07/01/05	WA TTY user complains his call was refused when applying for job as they insisted on speaking with him directly. Customer feels relay agents should inform callers of this and make everyone aware of relay being confidential. Apologized, explaining relay can not force anyone to accept a relay call. Let customer know I will pass their suggestions on to the account manager. No contact wanted.	07/01/05	Complaint taken into consideration. No contact information for follow up. Closing contact.
07/06/05	Voice call recipient couldn't tell if the agent was saying "75th" or "76th" so recipient tried to ask agent to clarify, but agent would interrupt and say "Speak to the customer." Recipient explained what was needed three times and agent would simply interrupt again, simply saying "Speak to the customer" and refused to listen to what recipient was asking. All agent needed to say was "seventy-five" or "seventy-six". Recipient finally had to ask agent to ask the customer to clarify by stating the numbers as "seven" and "six" instead of "seventy-six" since the agent refused to clarify her speech.	07/06/05	The ID number identified by the customer is not assigned to an employee in this call center. The contact does not provide enough information to permit further investigation, therefore further action is possible at this time. E-mail sent to customer on 7/6, and a follow up on 7/12. Customer replied on 7/15 saying that he was satisfied with the follow up.



Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
07/11/05	Customer complained agent did not stop typing a recording even though the VCO Customer hit the space bar numerous times. The VCO was trying to get the agents attention to let her know what option to press on the recording but the agent ignored the VCO's typing. Thanked caller for feedback and apologized for the inconvenience. Follow up requested, complained no one follows up with him even when he requests to do so.	07/11/05	Followed up with this agent and according to agent she did stop typing when interrupted and during that time, a voice person came on line and agent chose to continue with the call. Agent followed proper procedure in this situation. Followed up with the customer thru e mail 1 pm today.
07/28/05	Voice user works with deaf customers, complains agent typed she laughed at her TTY caller. This incorrect information relayed to her caller caused serious problem, resulting in his complaint toward her. Apologized for the problem, explaining the account manager will be notified, as the ID # was not available for follow up with the agent. Customer does want contact from account manager.	07/28/05	Called the customer, and discussed how the agents would occasionally describe background noises, which could lead to some misunderstanding on both parties. The customer was satisfied with the follow up.
07/30/05	(received via e-mail) On Monday July 25 around 11:30 pm CST, I received a message from an agent. This message was apparently meant for someone else, as I know of no one in WA and did not have a clue what the message was about. I am contacting you because I have received several calls since Monday during odd hours. Some of the calls were at 1:30 am CST! I would like all calls to stop. It is my cell phone and I do not know how anyone got the number in the first place. Also the message said something about how was Ohio, and I live in Iowa. Anyway, please let the right person know that they are to stop calling, it is the wrong number.	07/30/05	Because of the transparency and confidentiality requirements for relay providers, there is nothing a relay agent can do to prevent someone from calling a wrong number or leaving a message. The inbound caller is in control of the call. E-mailed customer and explained relay service.
08/08/05	Customer states the CA was careless. There were too many typing errors on the call. The customer states it was not technical because when she reached the next CA, the text was clear. Apologized. No follow up.	08/08/05	Trainer met with the agent and coached the agent on the importance of using appropriate phrases to pace the customer in order to eliminate so many errors. Agent understands. No follow up requested..
08/08/05	Customer called to report problem with TTY line outdial. Bill was transferred via Sprint LEC operator, who had tested the line for trouble and found no problems. Bill also had the equipment checked and replaced(an Ultratec Pro 80 Superprint), but is still unable to dial out. Apologized for inconvenience. Opened TT#263223. Follow-up requested.	08/22/05	The customer discovered that the telephone line was given away to somebody else, although the resident is still being billed for the telephone line service. Awaiting for follow-up by the caretaker (of the resident). Non-relay related issue, thus closing contact.
08/22/05	Customer states that the agent had just hung up on him in the middle of relaying his call. Thanked customer for letting us know and that we would forward this to the appropriate supervisor. Customer would also like follow-up from the agent's supervisor via e-mail.	08/22/05	Reviewed proper procedures with agent. Emailed customer to let them know that I went over the complaint with the agent and reviewed the proper procedures.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
08/27/05	VCO customer is having trouble getting the operator to hear her voice. Apologized, TT 353422. Follow-up requested.	08/30/05	Customer contacted on 8/30/05. It was determined that the VCO equipment was faulty, and the customer was advised to return the equipment for troubleshooting and/or replacement.
08/29/05	CA was rude, took a long time to dial out, and hung up on customer. Customer complained that is discrimination. Wishes to be contacted back by letter and by phone. Forwarded to AM per 10/7/04 email/fax.	09/07/05	Spoke with CA, she did remember having trouble with a Washington call, with garble. CA resolved garble issue and dialed out. Did not disconnect caller, but caller disconnected shortly after dialing out. CA followed normal procedure for resolving garble issues. Letter with explanation and apology was sent to customer on 9/7/05.
09/12/05	VCO customer called to complain that agent "wouldn't put the call through" to her brother, but didn't give an explanation why. Apologized. No follow-up requested.	09/12/05	Agent number is unassigned. Unable to follow up with agent without a correct Agent number.
09/14/05	Complaint: Voice caller complaint that operator did not know correct procedures. No follow up requested.	09/14/05	Discussed with operator. Went over proper procedures with operator.
09/15/05	A WA TTY customer called to say that the agent hung up on him while he was getting equipment to help him read the number he was calling. RCS: Apologized for the handling of the call No Contact requested	11/05/05	CA followed proper procedure to disconnect call after caller was idle for 3 minutes. CA apologizes for giving a bad experience.
09/22/05	WA VCO user complains that there is a continual problem with this agent not typing to her on her incoming calls, and she has no way to know who is calling her. Customer feels agent needs additional training. Apologized for problem, explaining I will be letting supervisor know for follow up with the agent. Test called and the transmission was fine. Customer does not want contact, just correct the problem.	09/22/05	Agent number has not been assigned. Unable to follow up with agent without a correct agent number.
09/27/05	Caller said she could not receive a call from her mother who is deaf calling through WA Relay. Gets message "Your call cannot be completed as dialed." Apologized to caller for the problem and opened TT ID 495696. Follow up required for problem resolution.	10/27/05	ITS had made some test calls over several weeks. Most calls went through, and some calls failed. Calls through the 800 number went through, however calls through 711 or SRO were haphazard. ITS spoke with customer who stated that the issue has been resolved as the mother has been able to place calls without problem.
10/07/05	Customer states that this agent had too many spelling errors during the call. This seemed very unusual for relay operators. RCS response: Thanked the customer for letting us know and assured that the complaint would be sent in as stated so that the problem could be investigated further. No call back requested	11/15/05	CA tested on typing speed and accuracy. Met standards. CA encouraged to constantly work on improving speed and accuracy.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
10/14/05	On Thursday, 10/13/05, the agent kept repeating the message to the outbound voice customer. That made the outbound voice customer mad so she hung up before the call was finished. Thanked customer for information. No follow up needed.	10/14/05	Agent coached on proper procedure to remain transparent.
10/19/05	TTY customer unable to dial number thru Relay to grocery store agent hears recording "number has been disconnected or no longer in service" the number can be dialed direct without a problem (apologized for problem encountered advised trouble ticket and complaint would be entered) T.T. 596293 Customer did not request contact	10/19/05	Sprint Tech: I have placed this test call numerous times - sometimes I am able to reach the Safeway, sometimes I reach the recording. I also reached the recording once from my desk phone. This is not a Relay issue but is more likely a problem with circuits between here and Washington, here and our host site in CA, or between CA and WA.
10/20/05	TTY user asked CA to dial an 800 number and hold for a live representative, but it appeared the CA hung up on him. Apologized for inconvenience and told TTY user this info would be forwarded to appropriate center for discussion to be held with CA.	10/20/05	Met with CA; didn't remember this particular call, but did mention that they had lots of TTY to 800 calls that morning. CA did mention that they had lots of calls holding for live reps and the inbound TTY would hang up. Some garbling also seen and the inbound TTY would also hang up then.
10/24/05	Customer asked CA to dial 425-xxx-xxxx. But the CA asked customer for the phone number again a couple of times when customer already gave to CA.	12/6/2005	Discussed with CA. Went over proper procedures.
10/24/05	CA did not respond to the caller very rude.	10/24/05	At time of complaint, this agent was not active.
10/31/05	Customer was not able to get the Operator's attention by using the space bar during the call. Says that this is a consistent problem. Updated customer notes to say "may interrupt with space bar." Would like the CA to be coached on the issue.	10/31/05	Operator coached regarding TTY users using the space bar to interrupt. CA will be more attentive in the future.
11/13/05	On November 8th this agent did not follow customer notes. Customer notes said when VCO user hits the space bar he wants agent to stop typing. Apologized for inconvenience and said would pass on to immediate supervisor. Customer would like email contact.	11/13/05	Supervisor met with agent and coached the agent on the importance of following the VCO user's instructions. Agent understands. Followed up with customer via email 11/21/05 and explained agent was coached on the importance of following VCO user's instructions.
11/14/05	A voice customer called to complain that the calls he made through WA Relay 711 were not being "routed properly." He has been making test calls to the company's TTY and the operators tell him it is constantly a "fast busy" signal. He says this is not possible, that relay must be routing the calls incorrectly. Apologized for inconvenience. Referred to LEC for 711 issue. He insisted it was a relay issue so I opened TT#727536. Follow-up requested.	11/16/05	Tech made test calls. Problem is on all major carriers, not only Sprint. Reported to Comcast, which is the LEC. Customer reported on 11/16 that calls are processing normally. Trouble ticket closed.
11/23/05	He/She hung up on me while I was talking to important customer for an appointment.	11/23/05	Apologized to customer for inconvenience. No follow up requested.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
11/24/05	Customer was upset that the agent didn't follow his requests. Once the outbound person disconnected the customer asked how the caller sounded and what was the last relayed message. This occurred on November 19, 2005. Apologized for the inconvenience. Customer was informed that this would be sent on to the CA's supervisor for review. Customer requests a letter back with resolution at address given.	11/24/05	Customer was sent a follow up letter letting him know the CA followed procedure. He was informed that the CA is not allowed to give out information after the call is over for confidentiality reasons and that the CA is not allowed to give personal opinion.
11/28/05	Customer stated the agent dialed wrong number and after caller informed agent they dialed wrong number and that they were very upset about the situation, the agent disconnected the call. The caller is very upset and wants corrective action taken, would also like a follow up and does not want to hear there was technical difficulty. Advised customer this complaint would be forwarded to appropriate supervisor. Follow up requested.	11/28/05	Agent could not remember the call. Reviewed proper procedures with agent. Called customer 12/1/05 at 12:41 pm - left message on answering machine. Called customer 12/5/05 at 1:51 pm - busy. Called customer 12/5/05 at 2:03 pm - busy. Attempted to contact the customer again at 9:26 pm on 12/5/05 - no answer. Sent email to customer provided by WA TRS Account Manager on 12/8/05.
11/30/05	Customer complained that CA didn't keep them informed. They asked to let them know if the number called was answered TTY or voice. Got no response from CA. Asked for follow-up	11/30/05	Met with CA. CA remembered call. Said she connected TTY to TTY when she heard tones. CA was coached on proper procedure on TTY to TTY calls. Called customer as requested and explained that the reason there was no response was because CA connected TTY to TTY and this would disconnect them. Explained procedure more thoroughly and customer was satisfied with explanation. Apologized for his inconvenience.
12/01/05	Customer said they gave CA a number to dial and told them it could be either TTY or voice answer. CA dialed out, TTY received Ringing 1-5 and then no response. TTY waited, and eventually disconnected. Redialed relay and got same CA again. Asked for supervisor who apologized. CA continued call, dialed out, and TTY user says they received Ringing 1-2, and then no response, waited and hung up. Apologized to customer. No follow up required.	12/01/05	This CA is not scheduled to work at all today. Possible wrong CA number. Due to how the TTY to TTY system is set up, once the agent sets the call up to be ready for TTY to TTY, the caller will not receive anything from relay or the outbound until something on the outbound is reached. If the outbound is answered TTY the CA follows procedure and then has no idea what happens with the outbound or inbound caller. Could be the connections weren't compatible so the inbound never received the outbound transmission.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/03/05	Upset VCO complaining that the CA will stop typing. He gives them the number to dial, they dial out and it keeps ringing so he tells them to redial and when they redial "it rings once, then twice, then three times and quits. Nothing. It happens all the time." When I tried to ask for more details, the caller became more upset and repeated what he already told me. I asked if he wanted a call back after the CAs were met with and he said he asked for call backs in the past and it "never happens". The caller hung up at that point.	12/03/05	Spoke with the agent about the issue and reviewed proper disconnect procedures. Agent does not remember hanging up on any customer but is advised of the consequences of doing so.
12/05/05	Upset VCO complaining that the CA will stop typing. He gives them the number to dial, they dial out and it keeps ringing so he tells them to redial and when they redial "it rings once, then twice, then three times and quits. Nothing. It happens all the time." When the supervisor tried to ask for more details, the caller became more upset and repeated what he already told. The supervisor asked if he wanted a call back after the CAs were met with and he said he asked for call backs in the past and it "never happens." The caller hung up at that point.	12/05/05	Supervisor met with agent who did not recall an event as described by the customer, however the agent was reminded to contact a supervisor if problems occur. As stated in the problem field, customer became more upset when tried to obtain more details and then hung up. Without pertinent information an investigation is impossible.
12/19/05	Caller said that she received a call (voice to VCO) thru relay but the agent refused to process the call because the outbound was able to speak. She said the agent at first refused to provide her id or get a supervisor when asked. Thanked caller for taking time to let us know and assured her a supervisor would follow up with the agent. Customer does request a follow-up call (VCO).	12/19/05	Agent remembered call and said the phone was answered by a voice customer who said they would interpret for the VCO user. The agent said relay would only be able to continue call if outbound had a TTY/VCO device on the phone. When outbound requested agent's number, the agent complied. The Outbound then started screaming for a supervisor and then disconnected. Attempted to contact customer for follow up: 12/20/05 8:22 PM - left message on answering machine with call back number 12/21/05 7:04 PM - left message on answering machine with call back number 12/23/05 6:36 PM - left message on answering machine with call back number Did not receive call back so closing ticket
12/20/05	Per customer notes, when customer hits space bar in an attempt to interrupt, CA does not acknowledge it.	12/20/05	Apologized to caller. No follow up requested.
12/23/05	WA VCO customer having garbling issues. Customer service did a test call and customer still had garbling. Customer service put in TT 917868. Customer would like a follow up when this issue is resolved.	12/27/05	According to back-up tech on 12/27, customer is no longer having garbling issue. Trouble ticket closed on 12/27.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/30/05	Caller stated that CA would not connect TTY to TTY call for her. She then asked for CA to dial another number and CA would not then hung up on caller. Apologized to caller and informed her it will be discussed with CA. No follow up requested.	12/30/05	Supervisor met with agent who did not remember an event of this nature and stated would never just hang up on any caller. The agent demonstrated knowledge of proper TTY to TTY procedures. No follow up requested.
01/05/06	A VCO customer called to complain that the agent did not stop typing even after he repeatedly pressed the space bar to interrupt the agent. The customer's notes specifically say, "May interrupt with space bar." Apologized. Follow up requested via email.	01/05/06	Spoke with agent. She does not recall this situation specifically but she said she remembers a call where something similar happened. She stopped typing and waited to receive typing from customer. She never received any typing and the caller hung up. Followed up with customer via e-mail and apologized for the problem.
01/14/06	The outbound answered voice (call from TTY user) and then put on TTY phone. As they tried to answer with TTY by answering call, Relay kept overtyping them and was not allowing them to introduce.	01/14/06	Spoke with agent on proper procedure.
01/26/06	Customer complained that he made several calls and the last number given was a toll free number, CA never dialed it. Customer waited for a while then CA disconnected the call. Apologized to caller and informed him that it will be discussed with CA. No follow up requested.	01/26/06	Spoke with agent -- call happened over two weeks ago, agent doesn't remember call. Coached on proper procedure and made aware of complaint.
02/02/06	Customer's complaint is that the agent did not show the ringing macro when placing a TTY to TTY call. Customer Service agent apologized to the caller and explained to the caller that TTY to TTY calls do not require agent to show the ringing. Caller requests a follow up.	03/08/06	Called 3/2 at 3:02 pm, no answer. Called 3/22 at 4:38 pm, no answer. Called 4/27 at 7:03 pm, no answer. Closing contact.
02/06/06	VCO caller said this agent didn't get the correct website address when they took it off the answering Machine of the company he was calling and they spelled it wrong. They were calling revelmonogram.com and the agent typed revel only. I explained the agent may not have known how to spell the company name however she should have gotten the rest of the information. I apologized and said I would write up a complaint. No Follow up.	02/06/06	Agent does not remember this call. She said that the recorder may have cut the information off or she may have been going back to the line to see if a live person answered. Reminded the agent to type all recordings verbatim unless instructed by the caller otherwise.
01/05/06	A VCO customer called to complain that the agent did not stop typing even after he repeatedly pressed the space bar to interrupt the agent. The customer's notes specifically say, "May interrupt with space bar." Apologized. Follow up requested via email.	01/05/06	Spoke with agent. She does not recall this situation specifically but she said she remembers a call where something similar happened. She stopped typing and waited to receive typing from customer. She never received any typing and the caller hung up. Followed up with customer via e-mail and apologized for the problem.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
02/07/06	TTY user placed a call, but the receiver had hung up. Then the TTY user wanted to know what the person sounded like (i.e. friendly, helpful, etc.), the CA responded with "CA does not have that info" and hung up on the caller before they could place another call. Caller did not want a call back. I informed the caller that I would pass this information on to the CA's supervisor.	02/07/06	CA coached on proper procedure regarding voice tone emotion descriptive use. CA coached on procedure for disconnecting callers.
02/13/06	Customer was upset. Said agent hung up on him while he was trying to give a number to dial. Apologized to customer.	02/13/06	Spoke to agent. He didn't recall this customer, although he did experience a few calls throughout the evening where the call would pop in as the TTY user began typing the # call the red disconnect banner would appear. I told agent to keep Team Leaders posted when this happens.
02/14/06	Customer's database did not populate to CA in the MN center. Customer database notes were entered in March 2001 and customer depends on CA having the information. Apologized. Assured customer we would investigate problem. TT 1172868 entered. No follow up requested.	02/14/06	Tech had reset the customer database. Tech made test calls to verify that the customer database notes were showing. Customer notified that issue has been resolved.
02/21/06	Customer states she was clear in her instructions. She had the CA call a number for automated banking. The customer explained that some CA's are able to effectively follow directions and get the information; the CA identified in this complaint needs additional training. Apologized. Supervisor will be notified. No follow up.	02/21/06	CA had trainer come over and observe the call, the automated banking was complex and the instructions given were not clear enough for the CA to complete on the first go round. Customer asked after the CA how it could be clearer and Trainer suggested up front letting the CA know how many accounts they will access and so forth and then give the instructions. Trainer did Coach the CA to ask in the beginning if they are unsure.
02/27/06	A WA TTY user called to complain that she was "very inflamed and flabbergasted" by the CA's handling of the call. She gave the agent instructions for dialing to an automated banking system, and in the middle of giving the instructions, the agent was dialing out and typing "(recording playing)" before she was finished. She asked the agent for the customer service number and he simply redialed the bank number. Apologized for inconvenience. Follow-up requested.	02/27/06	Met with agent, but he has no recollection of this specific call. Coached agent on always keeping focus on the call, and to never interrupt a customer while they are typing instructions. As well as following those instructions on every call.

03/01/06	Customer called in and gave calling to information and gave a "ga", but the agent did not respond. Caller gave several go aheads before disconnecting from the agent with still no response. Apologized to the customer for the inconvenience. Customer did not request follow-up call.	03/01/06	Unable to resolve complaint, because this specific agent number is not assigned to anybody.
03/10/06	Customer experiencing problems connecting to OR relay instead of WA relay when dialing to 711. Entered TT # 1300145 as requested by Account Manager to find resolution to the problem.	03/10/06	Customer lives half mile from state border. LATA testing complete without any problems. Customer needs to verify the location of his/her LEC. If the LEC is located in Oregon, then 711 calls would be routed to the Oregon Relay number.
03/13/06	Customer calling on behalf of his mother. Her VCO Ultratec phone is receiving calls, but cannot make calls. When she tries to dial it says "IR" on the screen. Agent thanked customer for calling. Agent took necessary information so someone can call the mother back and give her the needed assistance. Customer requested a call back.	03/13/06	Account Manager called customer, and found out that they had resolved the issue as the wiring was not configured correctly. No further assistance necessary.
03/15/06	Agent needs to take a class on communication. VCO user typed message stating to retrieve voice mail, but gave no # to dial (meaning the customer needed Answering Machine Retrieval). Became angry when agent asked for number calling.	03/18/06	Coached agent on proper procedure.
03/16/06	Caller says that phone numbers are not showing up on her Caller ID. This problem only occurs with calls through Relay. She says she has spoken to a couple of people at Customer Service already, but the problem still persists. Told caller that the information would be passed along and somebody will call her back. The caller would like a call back. Entered TT # 1342695.	03/16/06	Customer unavailable after three attempts. Tech is not able to proceed further without review with the customer concerning this problem. Unable to reproduce problem as reported.
03/17/06	TTY user was upset. They reached an answering machine (thought they got a recording) and wanted a live person -- kept calling the CA a robot -- then wanted a supervisor -- would not let me type -- every time I'd type -- they'd start with "No response is not a response."	03/18/06	Not agent error as the customer reached an answering machine, without any means of reaching live person.
03/28/06	Relay did not respond promptly.	03/28/06	Coached agent regarding response times for calls.
04/28/06	Non-agent error. VCO sometimes comes in on voice line, when switches over to TTY line, reads "Nbr calling pls" instead of "voice or type now" Only happens with Sioux Falls Center.	04/28/06	VCO customer came in on Voice line. When the call was transferred to TTY line, the VCO greeting does not appear even if the customer was branded VCO. Only standard TTY greeting. The customer did not wish a follow-up call so we were unable to offer re-branding.

05/01/06	WA VCO user complains her callers can not hear her voice through WA Relay. Apologized, explained I will let the technicians know to check the problem, referred to manufacturer to check her equipment also. Entered TT 1600745 Customer does want contact.	05/01/06	Tech has made test calls outside of Sprint network, and had concluded that the issue remains within her telephone line. Customer contacted on 5/18 and 6/6.
05/13/06	customer said agent did not inform customer when turbo code had been disabled. Customer had asked agent to disable turbo code and agent asked for number to dial. Apologized to customer and said contact would be filed.	05/13/06	Agent was coached on proper procedures to follow when requested to turn off turbo code. Follow up letter sent on 5/15/06.
05/13/06	Customer said agent did not tell customer when turbo code was disabled. customer called in and said to disable turbo code. Agent asked for number calling to. Customer did not know if turbo code had been disabled. Apologized to customer and said contact would be filed.	05/13/06	Operator was spoken to. Was advised that, in the future, to let the customer know when she disables the turbo code. Usually however, an operator just disables the turbo code and proceeds with the call.
05/14/06	VCO customer said that the CA did not inform her if turbo code was disabled. Customer has notes saying to disabled turbo code. At the beginning of the call, VCO asked if turbo code was disabled. The reply was "number you are calling to please." VCO asked again, and received the same response and then said "yes, just did that." Apologized for the inconvenience.	05/14/06	Invalid agent ID.

State of Washington
Department of Social & Health Services
Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing
Washington Relay Telecommunications Services
Sprint Relay
Annual Log Summary of Consumer Complaints
CG Docket 03-123
June 30, 2007

Acronym Log

CA: Communication Assistant
 TT: Trouble Ticket
 AM: Account Manager
 CS: Customer Service
 ODHH: Office of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
6/2/2006	WA Voice caller complains her mother, a VCO-user, was billed by MCI even though she has Sprint selected for her number in the relay database.	6/25/2007	Apologized for the problem explained and will inform the relay account manager for contact about this issue. Contact requested follow up. AM called and informed voice customer that the VCO user needs to call Sprint CS to update her Carrier of Choice (COC) on database profile and add "branded as VCO user" in profile. Customer was satisfied with resolution.
6/8/2006	CA 1804F hung up on TTY user. TTY user was upset.	6/12/2006	Apologized to the customer for the disconnection and explained that the CA will be coached by supervisor. A follow-up e-mail letter will be sent to the customer. Met with CA who did not recall ever having hung up on TTY user without first going through proper protocol. Not enough info given to know when the call took place, date, or time.
6/20/2006	Customer was upset regarding use of Sprint Relay, stating that there have been delays in processing calls, that s/he has been harassed, and agents are dishonest. CA 6091.	6/20/2006	Apologized and asked if client would like to place a call. Customer hung up. Customer appeared to be complaining about relay service in general terms.
7/27/2006	Customer called because their calls were not branded. CA 3180.	8/5/2006	Apologized to customer and opened TT 2165741. No follow-up requested. AM met with customer in person during outreach on 8/5/06. Customer mentioned that he has not experienced any problems with relay since the complaint was filed. AM mentioned that sometimes branding is lost and have verified that he is still branded as telebraille user.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
8/4/2006	Customer stated he had a horrible experience with this CA 7755F not knowing their job. Customer stated that he had asked the CA to dial a number and then received the message customer service how can I help you. He was not sure of what business he called or whether it was a male or female party answering the call. Most of the typing was garbled and he stated the CA informed him the garbling was due to his TTY and he needed to get it fixed. Customer also stated that only 3 out of the 8 times he's filed complaints he has received a follow-up when he requested it.	8/9/2006	Supervisor apologized to the customer and assured this would be forwarded to appropriate supervisor. Customer would like a follow-up letter or e-mail. Met with CA to review proper call procedures, reinforcing the need to gender and keep the caller informed. CA understood. On 8/8/2006, emailed customer apologizing for the incident.
8/17/2006	Caller's VCO Brand did not show to relay CA 3091F.	3/29/2007	Apologized for the problem and opened TT ID 2309904. Follow-up requested. AM attempted several times to contact customer in January and February. No response. Number appears to be out of service. Complaint closed due to lack of customer response.
8/17/2006	WA TTY user said CA 3103F disconnected him after he completed an 800 call. Customer did not know if it was his TTY or the CA hanging up.	8/18/2006	Apologized for any inconvenience and told customer the CA's supervisor would be informed. No follow-up requested. CA does not recall anything unusual that happened on 08/17/2006. Reviewed procedures for waiting for customer instructions before discontinuing call.
8/30/2006	WA VCO user complains that after the CA 1393M dialed a number (missed info) was typed without explaining what occurred. This happened twice. CA would not respond when customer questioned this, and then hung up on her.	8/30/2006	Apologized and explained agents are to keep the caller informed and never to hang up. No follow up requested. Spoke with CA who did not recall this particular call. CA knows that if questioned by relay user, CA can respond and shows knowledge of correct call handling procedures.
9/15/2006	WA Voice customer called in rather irritated about CA 1658 or 1685. Customer said she could not understand the CA would not repeat what was just said. CA said s/he could not be part of the call and typed that to the customer. The customer would not explain whether it was the tone of the CA's voice or what it was they could not understand. The Customer also was not sure which CA it was.	9/15/2006	Apologized to customer; no follow up requested. No time frame of when this call came in; supervisor did assist this CA on a problem call where the outbound was trying to ask the CA questions. The CA tried to redirect the voice person to speak directly to the caller and stated that the CA was not part of the conversation. Voice user was getting upset that the CA was not answering any of the questions they were asking; CA kept repeating that everything heard was being typed by the caller. CA followed correct relay procedure.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
9/20/2006	WA voice caller complained that CA 3180 was rude during her phone call. Customer explained that she reached a busy line and, when CA came back to tell her the line was busy, the CA rudely asked what she wanted to do and then the caller stated she was waiting for the operator, the CA then asked if she was not paying attention to the call.	9/22/2006	Apologized to customer. Coached agent on proper procedure. No customer follow-up requested
9/21/2006	WA TTY Customer stated that CA 1611 didn't respond after number was given to dial. Customer stated they waited for 15 minutes and couldn't get any response from the CA.	9/28/2006	Supervisor apologized for the inconvenience and assured customer this would be forwarded to the appropriate supervisor. No follow-up requested. CA said that he did dial out the call, but there was a delay between the time the caller was informed, and the time the CA heard any ringing on the outbound line. The CA stated the customer had interrupted before the CA could inform the caller of the call process, and then hung up.
10/31/2006	VCO user was leaving a message and when finished, the person receiving the call heard the CA say that the VCO user sounded like Yoda. CA unknown.	10/31/2006	No action could be taken because the customer did not provide an CA identification number.
11/14/2006	TTY customer said CA 2149F refused to get supervisor; was rude and controlling. The CA was telling customer what to do and sarcastically typed slowly on purpose. Caller wanted a live person, but the CA let the auto system play and typed the recording. Caller asked a question and the relay CA said "that information was provided, you didn't get it." Also during the call when the outbound was on the line, the CA typed, "relay operator will slow pace so you are able to read your message without missing anything."	11/14/2006	Informed customer a complaint would be filed with appropriate person. Caller wants follow-up via e-mail. Met with the CA who stated she was trying to help the customer by typing slower and providing info from recording. Explained to the CA the choice of words used could come across as being rude and coached CA on selecting better choice of words to demonstrate a willingness to assist. Followed up with customer via e-mail apologizing for the inconvenience and informed the customer after meeting with CA, it was believed that the CA's intentions were trying to help by typing slower and relaying the recording. However the CA was coached on using better choice of words to demonstrate a willingness to assist.
11/16/2006	Voice customer said CA 6304 tone was rude. Customer was confused about 711 being the complete phone number for relay and CA rudely replied, "Well, if you would listen..." etc. When customer asked who was calling, CA said, "Well, I don't know. I'm just the CA." Customer says it was the way the CA said it more than what she said.	11/16/2006	Assured customer that this would be addressed. Did not wish to be contacted. CA was coached by team leader on proper phone etiquette when answering questions and on CSI procedures for all customers.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
11/17/2006	WA TTY caller dialed 711 to reach WA relay but was connected to Missouri relay. The caller was calling a local number but the computer showed it was long distance. The CA 3051 also told the caller it looked like they were calling from Florida, when they were actually calling from WA.	03/29/2007	CS apologized to the customer. Customer would like to have a follow-up with resolution. CS opened TT 2967011 Unable to duplicate problem as reported. Test through both call controllers completed without incident. AM followed up with customer to share results of the TT.
11/17/2006	Voice customer was upset when the CA 8518F was laughing while connecting the call. The customer felt that relay operators in general should be more professional.	11/29/2006	Apologized to customer for any inconvenience. Informed customer that this CA will be met with and coached by supervisor. Coached CA to stay focused to the processing of relay calls and attuned to customers' requests at all times. Mailed a follow-up letter to the customer.
11/21/2006	Voice caller said CA 6119F was having a conversation with another CA while relaying the call two different times and then started cleaning her headset, causing a great deal of static to the relay customer. When caller transferred call to another department, the CA disconnected the call. Caller was very upset at the CA's conduct.	11/30/2006	Apologized to caller for the problem. CA was coached by team leader on proper floor etiquette, such as talking while on a call and the ramifications of improperly disconnecting calls. No follow-up requested.
11/29/2006	Customer said that CA3311 disconnected call in middle of call. Customer initiated the call at approximately 7 PM Pacific time and the call was disconnected at 7:20 PM.	12/7/2006	Customer requested follow-up. CA no longer employed. Contacted customer to apologize.
12/11/2006	WA VCO customer states when calling through relay the outbound person cannot hear the VCO person's voice.	03/29/2007	CS apologized and entered in TT #3123790. Follow-up requested. TT #3123790 reports testing occurred and problem could not be reproduced. Technician and AM made four attempts to call customer, unsuccessfully. Complaint closed due to lack of customer response.
12/13/2006	Customer complained about the typing speed of the CA 5272F took 2 ½ minutes to type from an answering machine message.	1/12/2007	Complaint e-mailed to call center trainer for resolution. Apology was sent via e-mail on 01/11/2007. Customer was informed that CA was coached on importance of typing speed and accuracy. A follow-up test was given to assure speed was up to standards.
12/14/2006	Customer stated CA 3320M dialed to an answering machine and customer typed "Never mind operator have a nice holiday." Customer stated the CA then redialed to the answering machine to leave that message and obviously had not carefully read the message.	12/14/2006	Supervisor apologized for inconvenience and assured this would be forwarded to appropriate Supervisor. No follow-up requested. CA does not recall this situation and said he may have sent the macro in error, but he did not voice this message. CA knows correct procedure for leaving messages.

Date of Complaint	Nature of Complaint	Date of Resolution	Explanation of Resolution
12/20/2006	WA TTY customer states after receiving no connection to person she was calling, the CA 7727F hung up on her.	3/29/2007	Relay CS apologized. Customer requested follow-up. AM called on 02/06 and 03/01, leaving messages to contact back by phone or e-mail if there are continued problems. No response from the customer, therefore Complaint is closed.
1/2/2007	Customer asked CA 2295 twice to get a supervisor and he didn't do it. Customer asked him if he could read her and he didn't respond.	1/8/2007	Supervisor explained that it was possible the computer rolled over, and when this happens, the CA can't see anything she types. When the call came into Ohio, it was a roll over and when the supervisor typed to her, she was slow about responding. Supervisor met with agent who demonstrated procedural knowledge of what to do if customer does not respond and understands the proper steps.
1/2/2007	Caller claimed CA 7605 did nothing for him/her. She asked operator to dial a number and the operator did not do it.	1/2/2007	Explained that it was possible the computer rolled over, and when this happens, the CA can't see anything she types. When the call came into Ohio, it was a roll over and when the supervisor typed to her, she was slow about responding. Coached agent on following customer requests. No follow-up requested.
1/10/2007	Customer VCO branding not showing.	1/26/2007	CS apologized and opened TT ID 3303967. Follow-up required for problem resolution. Customer did not provide follow-up information to contact after problem was resolved. Complaint closed due to lack of contact information.

1/23/2007	Customer called stating that VCO procedures were not followed by CA 5187M.	3/30/2007	CA was talked to and demonstrated knowledge of VCO procedures.
2/19/2007	WA VCO customer complained that nobody has been able to hear her on relay calls for the past week or so, even though the volume is as loud as it goes..	3/29/2007	Apologized for inconvenience; follow up requested. Opened TT 3582893. Technicians were unable to reproduce the problem at the center. Suspect it might be an issue with VCO user's equipment. Made several attempts in February and March to reach customer. No response. Complaint closed.
2/20/2007	TTY caller complained that CA 7641 hung up on caller without a GA to SK.	3/29/2007	CA was coached on proper procedures. No follow-up requested.
2/25/2007	Voice customer calling voice 800 number for WA, but keeps getting only TTY tone, fax machine tones, then is disconnected. The customer then tried to dial into relay through 711 and received tty tones and got disconnected.	2/27/2007	Relayed information to the customer that if customer contacts CS, they can be branded correctly. Also, if they stay on the line, a voice CA will come on the line after TTY tones end.
3/9/2007	Caller reported that CA 3149F did not respond to the question "did we reach answering machine?" They had to type the question twice and long delay before any answered was typed.	3/9/2007	CS apologized for the inconvenience. No follow-up requested. Coached CA on importance of customer focus. However, this delay may have been a technical issue.
3/12/2007	VCO customer wanted to make a long distance call. Gave prepaid number, pin number, and destination number. Waited 2 minutes, but got no response. Turned volume up and she didn't hear dial tone. She wanted to know if he was still there. CA 2353M.	3/13/2007	Supervisor met with CA who stated he remembered call. CA stated he asked the caller to repeat the information because he couldn't remember all the numbers, but got no response from the caller. Supervisor coached the agent on how to write down any information needed to process the call and also re-iterated that if the caller does not respond to his requests to be sure to repeat it again. Agent understands. No follow-up requested.
3/14/2007	Caller claims that after a lengthy conversation with friend through Relay, he typed something as the outbound party was hanging up. The CA 2404F then harassed and made fun of him for being deaf and blind. The caller was very dismayed by the operator's hostility and insensitivity.	3/14/2007	Apologized for the difficulty with the particular operator and assured caller that the matter would be dealt with. Also told caller that his access to relay services would not be blocked in retribution for the complaint after he expressed fears that this might happen. No follow-up requested.
3/27/2007	TTY customer said CA 2283M hung up before s/he could give another number to dial.	3/28/2007	Apologized to customer and informed them a complaint would be filed for this CA. No follow-up requested. Customer service will coach CA on appropriate call procedures.

4/9/2007	CA dialed number and it was busy; customer typed but CA 2254 did not answer. Typed 3 times “can you read me?” but no response from CA so customer hung up. Customer would like all supervisors at all CSD Relay centers to remind CA’s to pay attention and not delay calls and keep caller informed.	4/9/2007	Supervisor coached the CA on the importance of keeping customer informed. CA understands. No follow-up requested.
4/10/2007	TTY customer said CA 5225 did not pay attention to his requests. Then, when he asked for a supervisor, CA transferred him to Sprint CS without asking.	4/10/2007	CA does not remember this incident, but demonstrated knowledge of proper procedure to transfer only when it is requested.
4/10/2007	CA 2344 hung up when customer finished first call. He wanted to make a second call but CA did not wait.	4/10/2007	CA is no longer employed with CSD so could not be coached on proper procedures.
4/10/2007	TTY caller couldn’t read messages (letters/numbers run together) during a number of calls.	4/13/2007	Apologized and attempted to obtain information about equipment but caller did not response. TT #3920428 was closed. Since garbling does occur on about 3% of all calls, this will be monitored to see if there are continued complaints. Followed up with customer and left message to contact if problem continues.
4/12/2007	Customer said CA 6323M hung up on her without leaving the message requested. She asked her parents if they had received the message she asked the CA to leave and they said no. All the operator typed was “Thank you for using the relay,” then disconnected without giving any confirmation that a message was left.	5/17/2007	Apologized; customer requested follow-up. The CA was terminated for work performance issues. Trainer followed-up with customer via e-mail on 04/24/2007. Customer responded that she was pleased with the follow-up.
4/20/2007	CapTel Dialing issue – Unable to dial regional 800-number.	4/20/2007	Technical Support made an adjustment so CapTel user can successfully make captioned call to regional 800 number.
5/1/2007	At approximately 8:06 PM Pacific Time, the CA dialed a number. Phone rang 10 times with no answer. Customer asked to redial. Phone rang 6 times then stopped. Customer was waiting for relay but CA 7164 disconnected customer.	5/1/2007	The complaint came in at 10:11 PM on 04/30/2007. Forwarded on to proper center for follow-up. The CA did not have recollection of this specific call and is not aware of any technical issues on this date. The CA understood that an intentional disconnect can result in disciplinary action and assured supervisor that she will report any known issues.
5/2/2007	Customer stated she had a constant garbling problem when calling in to CS. She stated that she never has any garbling problem with relay agents so she knows it is not her phone.	5/3/2007	Called customer back using TTY and call went perfectly. Apologized to the customer and let her know a TT #4064159 would be opened. Customer did not request a follow-up. This is a known issue that has been escalated to technical support. Called customer back on TTY later in the day without garbling.

5/17/2007	VCO customer stated that he has not been able to call anyone for a while. Outbound voice person unable to hear VCO customer at all. Customer wants AM to follow-up by mail or e-mail. The customer's VCO was not set up to receive calls.	5/22/2007	Apologized to caller. Contacted customer service via e-mail to see if there were further problems. Customer e-mailed back stating his VCO has been working fine since he filed the complaint and is satisfied with the service.
-----------	---	-----------	---

Total Number of Interstate Relay Calls by type of TRS

TRS	STS	Captioned Telephone	VRS	IP Relay	Total Complaints
37,326	756	457	*	*	42

***Washington State relay provider will report data directly to the FCC.**